

K. MARX & F. ENGELS

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

With an introduction and Explanatory notes

BY

D. RYAZANOFF,

Director of the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow

BURMON PUBLISHING HOUSE

72 HARRISON ROAD : : CALCUTTA

Published by
B. BURMON
BURMON PUBLISHING HOUSE
72, Harrison Road, Calcutta.

Our Agent
PROGRESSIVE BOOK HOUSE
Bank Road, Dharwar.

First Indian Edition

1944

[*The text of the Manifesto is a new translation from the German, made in 1928 for Martin Lawrence. The Rest of the work is translated from the revised (1922) edition of Ryazanoff's The Communist Manifesto (in Russian).*

Rs. 4-8

Printed by
M. BHATTACHARJEE,
BOSE PRESS
30, Brojo Mitter Lane, Calcutta.

Introduction

THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

1847—1852

THE Communist League, that first international organisation of proletarians whose program was a communist one, came into being during the year 1847. Marx (1818-1883) and Engels (1820-1895) played an active part in its foundation. The German revolutionists, with the help of British and French sympathisers, had already made several attempts to found a revolutionary organisation on an international scale. In 1885, nearly forty years after the foundation of the League, Engels wrote an outline history of the German revolutionary movement which had ultimately given birth to the Communist League. This sketch appeared as the introduction to a reprint of Marx's pamphlet concerning the trial of the Cologne communists, and has been ever since the main source of information, not only to Mehring but likewise to all the writers who have dealt with the history of the League. I shall, therefore, let Engels speak for himself.

"In the year 1834, a group of German refugees in Paris founded a secret society known as the Exiles' League. The organisation was democratic and republican in spirit. During the year 1836, the extremists broke away and constituted themselves into the Federation of the Just, a body whose members were mainly proletarian. The parent organisation, to which only such sleepy-heads as Jakobus Venedey remained faithful, soon fell into a profound slumber; by the year 1840, when the police routed out a few sections, it was the merest shadow of its former self. The Federation, however, developed quickly. Originally it was a German outlyer of French working-class communism which owed its theoretical opinions mainly to the Babouvist tradition, and which was taking definite shape and form about this time in Paris. Among these circles, community of goods was demanded as the natural outcome of "equality." The aims of the Federation of the Just were the same as those of other Parisian secret societies of the period. Its activities were about evenly divided between propaganda and conspiratorial work. Paris was still regarded as the focal point of revolutionary action, although the preparation of revolutionary upheavals in Germany, should occasion arise, was not excluded from the program. Since, however, Paris was looked upon as the place where the decisive battle would occur, the Federation was in reality not much more than a German branch of the French secret societies, and in especial of the Societe des Saisons which was under the leadership of Blanqui (1805-1881) and Barbes (1809-1870). Indeed, the Federation was in such close touch with the Societe des Saisons that, when the French rose in revolt on May 12, 1839, the members of the Federation of the Just fought shoulder to

shoulder with their French brothers and together they all suffered a common defeat.

"Karl Schapper and Heinrich Bauer were arrested. The government of Louis Philippe was content to expel them from France after they had undergone a lengthy imprisonment while awaiting trial. Both men came to London. Schapper had been a student of forestry at Giessen University, and had, in 1832, participated in Georg Buchner's (1813-1857) conspiracy. On April 3, 1833 he took part in the storming of the police station in Frankfort-on-the-Main. After this exploit he went abroad and in February, 1834, joined Mazzini's forces in Savoy. Built on a heroic scale, resolute and energetic by temperament, ever ready to risk life and limb, Schapper was the prototype of the professional revolutionist of the eighteen-thirties. His steady development from demagogue to communist proves that, though his mind was somewhat obtuse, he was nevertheless receptive of new ideas. Once convinced, he held tenaciously to his opinions, and precisely because of this his passion for the cause often overwhelmed his better judgment. After the event he was always ready to acknowledge himself in the wrong. He was a man of genuine metal all through, and his services to the German working-class movement will never be forgotten.

"Heinrich Bauer came from Franconia. He was a shoe-maker by trade, a little man of lively humour, alert and active. His diminutive frame held a fund of shrewdness and determination.

"Once established in London, Schapper who had been earning his living as compositor in Paris, now tried to blossom out as a teacher of languages. He and Bauer gathered up the broken threads of the Federation and made London the centre of its activities. Joseph Moll (died 1849) joined their company (he may already have done so in Paris). His trade was that of watchmaker; he came from Cologne; was a Hercules of moderate stature—how often have I seen him and Schapper triumphantly defend the entrance to a hall against hundreds of assailants!—; a man no less energetic and resolute than his two comrades, but far outstripping them in intelligence. Not only was he a born diplomatist, as the success of his innumerable missions, amply testifies; he also had a mind better fitted than either Schapper or Bauer for the understanding of theoretical issues. I made their acquaintance in London during 1843. They were the first proletarian revolutionists I had ever met, and although our outlooks differed in certain details in those early days (for what they had in the way of narrow-minded equalitarian communism* was amply compensated in me by a no less narrow-minded philosophical arrogance!), I can never forget the profound impression these three men made upon me, a youngster at the time, just entering upon manhood.

"In London, as to a lesser degree in Switzerland, freedom of association and of public meeting was of inestimable advantage to them in their activities. On

*By "*equalitarian communism*" I mean a theory of communism which is exclusively or mainly founded upon a demand for equality.

February 7, 1840, the German Workers' Educational Society was founded. This was not an underground organisation but functioned in the full light of day. At the time of writing [1885] it is still in existence. The society served as a recruiting ground for the Federation; and, since the communists were the most active and the most intelligent members of the Society, as always, they took it as a matter of course that the leadership of the Society should be in the hands of the Federation. Very soon the Federation could boast of several 'communes,' or as they were then called 'huts,' in London. Here, as in Switzerland and elsewhere, tactics were dictated by circumstances. Wherever workers' associations could be formed they were made use of in much the same way. Where legal prohibitions prevented such methods, the organisations took the form of choral societies, gymnastic societies, and the like. Communications were kept up mainly by a continuous flow of travelling members going to and fro among the groups. Where necessary, these travelling members functioned as emissaries. In either case the activity of the Federation was greatly furthered by the governments of the day, which in their wisdom, by exiling every workman who had earned their disfavour—and in nine cases out of ten such a worker was a member of the Federation—converted him into an emissary.

"The reconstituted Federation grew apace. In Switzerland this growth was particularly noticeable. Here such men as Weitling (1808-1870), August Becker (1814-1875, an extremely gifted man, but one whose temperamental instability brought him to grief, just as similar infirmity of purpose had doomed so many other Germans), and others formed a strong organisation whose principles were more or less adapted from Weitling's communistic system. This is not the place to discuss Weitling's communism. But, in order to show the importance of Weitling's system as the first stirring of an independent philosophy of the German proletariat, I cannot do better than quote Marx's own words. Here is what he wrote in the Paris 'Vorwärts' of 1844: 'Where could the German bourgeoisie, including its philosophers and divines, point to a work championing bourgeois political emancipation which could in any way compare with Weitling's *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* [Guarantees of Harmony and Freedom]? One who compares the jejune and faint-hearted mediocrity of German political literature with this tremendous and brilliant debut of the German working class, one who compares the huge baby-shoes of the proletariat with the dwarfed and down-at-heel political shoes of the bourgeoisie, cannot but prophesy that Cinderella will grow to giant stature.' The colossus stands before us to-day, and he has many years yet to grow before he will have attained his full proportions.

"Many groups were formed in Germany which from their very nature could not be expected to persist. But those that perished were replaced by fresh groups which outnumbered the losses among the more transient ones. Not until 1846, seven years after the first groups had come into existence, did the German police discover in Berlin (Mentel, born 1812) and in Magdeburg (Beck) vestiges of the Federation. But the authorities were not in a position to follow up their discoveries.

"Before leaving Paris and fleeing to Switzerland, Weitling had, in 1840, gathered the scattered elements of the Federation together.

"The nucleus of the Federation was composed of tailors. Germans practising tailoring business were to be found everywhere: in Switzerland, London, Paris. In the latter town, German was so much the speech of the trade that in 1846 I knew a Norwegian tailor who had journeyed by sea from Drontheim to France, and who had, during eighteen months, hardly spoken a word of French, although he had learned to speak German excellently. In 1847, there were two 'communes' of the Federation in Paris. One was mainly composed of tailors, the other of furniture makers.

"No sooner was the centre of gravity transferred from Paris to London than a new phenomenon came to the fore. The Federation, from being a German organisation, gradually became transformed into an international affair. In addition to German and Swiss, persons of other nationalities to whom the German language could serve as a medium of communication were to be found in the Federation: there were Scandinavians, Dutch, Hungarians, Bohemians, southern Slavs; also there were Russians and Alsations. In 1847, a British grenadier in full uniform was a regular attendant at the meetings. Soon the Federation was rechristened Communist Workers' Educational Society. On the membership cards we find the following slogan: 'All men are brothers' in at least twenty languages, although some of the translations might have been bettered! Besides this society which functioned in the open, there was also a secret organisation. This, too, soon assumed an international character. At first the international aspect was limited in scope; it was forced upon the Federation by the mixed nationalities of its members, and by the gradual realisation that, for the revolution to be effective, it needs must take place on a European scale. Thus far, but no further. Nevertheless the foundations of internationalism were laid.

"Those who had fought in the insurrectionary movement of May, 1839, and had sought refuge in London, formed a link between the members of the Federation and the French revolutionists. Similarly in the case of the Polish radicals. The more conspicuous Polish refugees, however, people in the public eye, were of course—like Mazzini (1805-1872) among the Italian refugees—hostile rather than friendly to the communists. The Chartists, because of the specifically British nature of their movement, were ignored by the Federation as unrevolutionary. At a later date I was able to bring them into touch with the leaders of the Federation in London.

"Circumstances led to yet other alterations in the character of the Federation. As was meet in those days, Paris was still looked upon as the birthplace of the revolution. But the movement had now cut loose from the Parisian conspirators. As the Federation grew in size so, likewise, did it grow in the consciousness of its own functions. More and more did its members come to feel that the principles advocated by the Federation were taking root among the German working class, and that the German workers were destined to be the standard-bearers of the

European workers as a whole, whether they hailed from the north or from the east. Weitling was a theoretician of communism, who could rank with his French rivals as an equal. The experience of May 12, 1839, had at last taught the lesson that the policy of abortive risings was useless. Although every event was still looked upon as the possible starting-point of a revolutionary outbreak, although the old, semi-conspiratorial rules were kept in their integrity, this was no more than a remnant of revolutionary defiance which was already coming into collision with wiser and better outlooks.

"The social theories of the Federation, in so far as they existed at all, were wrong-headed. This was due to the conditions of the time. The proletarian part of the membership consisted entirely of manual workers. They were exploited by men who, even in the great metropolis, were nearly always small masters. The exploitation of large-scale tailoring, so-called 'confection,' the transformation of the work into domestic industry on behalf of a great capitalist, was still in its infancy in the London of that epoch. The exploiter was a small master, and the workers in the trade lived in hopes of themselves becoming small masters. In addition, vestiges of the guild spirit still adhered to the German craftsmen. They were not as yet fully fledged proletarians, were only on the way to becoming members of the modern proletariat, were still hangers-on of the petty bourgeoisie, had not at that date become the direct opponents of the bourgeoisie, the large-scale capitalists. These craftsmen, to their eternal honour, instinctively foresaw the future development of their class, and, though not fully conscious of the fact, were pressing forward toward organising themselves as the party of the proletariat. Yet it was impossible to expect that their ingrained craft prejudices should not occasionally trip them up, especially when it came to a detailed criticism of extant society, that is to say, when the investigation of economic facts was demanded of them. I do not believe that one single member of the Federation had ever read a book on political economy. No matter! 'Equality,' 'Brotherhood,' 'Justice,' gave them a leg over every theoretical stile!

"Alongside the communist theory devised by the Federation and by Weitling, another, and very different, theory of communism was emerging. While living in Manchester, I was made painfully aware that economic factors, hitherto assigned an insignificant role or no role at all by historians, were, at least under modern conditions, a decisive power in the world; that they were the cause of contemporary class antagonisms; that in lands where, on account of great industrial developments (as in England), these antagonisms have come into the open, they are creating a new political party, fresh party struggles, and, consequently, are completely changing the face of political life. Already in 1844, writing in the 'Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher,' Marx showed that he had come to the same conclusions. He maintained that it was not the State which conditioned and regulated bourgeois society, but, rather, bourgeois society which conditioned and regulated the State; that, therefore, politics and the history of political development must be examined in the light of economic conditions and their evolution, not the other way about as heretofore. When I visited Marx in Paris during

the summer of 1844, it was obvious that we were in complete harmony as far as theoretical matters were concerned. From that time our working partnership may be dated. When in the spring of 1845 we met again, this time in Brussels, Marx had already elaborated the main points in his materialist theory of history. Now we set about the task of working the theory out in its manifold details.

"This theory, which was to revolutionise the science of history, this theory for which Marx is mainly responsible (for I played a very insignificant part in the matter), was of the utmost importance to the contemporary working-class movement. Communism, among the French and the Germans, Chartism, among the Britishers, were now no longer to be looked upon as chance phenomena which might just as well not have appeared at all. These movements were seen to be an expression of the aspirations of an oppressed class, one that had arisen as the outcome of modern life, the class of the proletariat; they appeared as more or less developed forms of a historically necessary struggle against the ruling class, the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, as forms of the class struggle, they differed from earlier class struggles in the following particular: the oppressed class to-day, the proletariat, cannot achieve its own emancipation without liberating the whole of society from class divisions. The victory of the proletariat will bring the class war to an end. Communism no longer signified the fantastical elaboration of a social ideal as nearly achieving perfection as possible. On the contrary. Communism meant henceforward an understanding of the nature, the conditions, and the general aims arising therefrom, of the struggle into which the proletariat had entered.

"We had no wish to propound these new scientific conclusions in ponderous tomes for the edification of professional wisecracks. Quite otherwise. We had both of us entered bag and baggage into the political movement, we had certain connections with the educated world (especially in the western provinces of Germany), and had close ties with the organised proletariat. In duty bound, we had to place our outlook upon a firm scientific foundation; but it was no less incumbent upon us to win over the European proletariat in general and the German proletariat in particular to our convictions. No sooner had we made the matter clear to ourselves than we set to work. We founded the German Workers' Society of Brussels, and took possession of the 'Deutsche Brüsseler Zeitung.' This periodical remained in our hands until the February revolution. Through the intermediation of Julian Harney we got into touch with the Chartists. I contributed to the 'Northern Star,' the central organ of the Chartist movement, whose editor was Harney. We also collaborated with the Brussels democrats. Indeed, Marx was vice-president of the German section of the Democratic League, an international organisation founded in Brussels. Further, we linked up with the French democrats who were running a newspaper called 'La Reforme,' to which I was a contributor. In a word, our relations with radical and proletarian organisations and journals left nothing to be desired.

"Our relations with the Federation of the Just were as follows. Of course we knew of the existence of this body. Schapper had suggested that I become a

member as long ago as 1843. But for obvious reasons, I had refused his invitation. Nevertheless, we kept up a lively correspondence with the London 'commune,' and were even more closely associated with Dr. Everbeck, who was then the leading figure in the Paris 'communes.' Without troubling ourselves about the internal situation of the Federation we were nevertheless kept informed as to every important issue. By word of mouth, by letters, through the newspapers, we pressed our theoretical outlook upon the notice of the members. In addition we issued lithographed circulars on special occasions (as, for instance, in connection with the internal affairs of the communist party now in process of formation), and posted these to our friends and correspondents the world over.

"A young student, Hermann Kriege (1820-1850) by name, from Westphalia, emigrated to America. He gave himself out to be an emissary from the Federation, associated with the madcap Harro Harring, and, with the prestige of the Federation to back him, proposed to inaugurate the revolution in South America. He founded a newspaper in which he expounded, in the name of the Federation, an extravagantly sentimental form of communism based upon love, overflowing with love. We immediately sallied forth to the attack by means of a circular which did not fail of its effect. As far as the Federation was concerned, Kriege was heard of no more.

"Later, Weitling came to Brussels. But he was no longer the simple-hearted young journeyman tailor, who, rather awed by his own talents, had once been so eager to get a clear picture of just what a communist world would look like. He was now the great man whose superiority made him the butt of the envious, one who was ever suspecting his rivals, his secret enemies, of laying traps to snare him; a prophet hounded from one country into another; a seer who had a recipe ready to hand for the realisation of heaven upon earth, and fancied that every one he encountered was trying to steal it from him. He had already become embroiled with the members of the Federation in London and in Brussels. In the latter town Marx and his wife had welcomed Weitling with well-nigh superhuman forbearance. But Weitling could not get on with any one. He left for the States, hoping that there he would be able to continue his prophetic mission.

"All these manifold circumstances contributed their quota to bringing about a change in the Federation. The changed outlooks were particularly noticeable among the London members. From the theoretical side, the inadequacy both of French equalitarian communism and of Weitling's brand of communism was becoming plainer day by day. Weitling's endeavour to bring back communism to early Christian practice—such luminous suggestions are, in very truth, to be found in his "gospel of poor sinners"—had, in Switzerland, either thrown the movement into the hands of a fool like Albrecht (1809-1872) or condemned it to exploitation by bogus prophets like Kuhlmann. "True socialism" [see the section of the Manifesto dealing with 'German or True Socialism'], the affectation of a few men of letters, was no more than the translation of French socialist expressions into Hegelian German sicklied over with sentimental effusions about love. It had been introduced into the Federation by Kriege and other readers of the

relevant literature, and by now the slobbering spinelessness of the doctrine was disgusting the veteran revolutionists of the Federation. The theoretical ideas hitherto held were obviously becoming untenable, and the errors arising out of these theories were more and more clearly defined. Consequently, those responsible for the Federation in London were increasingly convinced that the new theories put forward by Marx and myself were correct. Undoubtedly the growth of this conviction was fostered by two men who happened to be members of the London 'commune' at the time, two men who far outstripped the other leaders in theoretical competence. These were Karl Pfander (died 1876), the miniature painter from Heilbronn, and Georg Eccarius (died 1889), the tailor from Thuringen.*

"To cut a long story short, Moll came to Brussels in the spring of 1847. He visited Marx, and then came on to Paris to see me. His mission was to invite us once more, at the urgent request of his comrades, to enter the Federation. They were all convinced of the general correctness of our views, and no less convinced were they that the time had come for ridding the Federation of its traditional forms and conspiratorial methods. Should we enter the Federation, we should be given an opportunity, at a congress, to lay our theories of communism before the members in the shape of a manifesto, which would then be published as the manifesto of the Federation. Thus, he continued, we should be contributing to the replacement of the old Federation by an organisation more in keeping with the time and with our common aims.

"We were in no doubt as to the need of an organisation for the purpose of carrying on propaganda among the German workers; nor did we fail to realise that such an organisation, in so far as it was not of a purely local character, would have to be a secret one even outside the German frontiers. Now, just such an organisation already existed in the shape of the Federation. What we had hitherto been condemning was now recognised by the Federation itself as erroneous; we ourselves were asked to help in the work of reorganisation. Could we refuse? Certainly not. We became members of the Federation. From among our own friends in Brussels, Marx was able to found a 'commune'. For my part, I visited the three 'communes' which existed in Paris.

"In the summer of 1847 the first congress of the Federation took place in London. Wilhelm Wolff was the delegate from the Brussels 'commune,' and I represented the Paris 'communes.' The main theme for discussion was the question of reorganisation. Every vestige of its old mystical nature, the heritage of conspiratorial days, was now discarded. The Federation was organised into

** Pfander died in London about eight years ago [1876]. He was a man of fine intelligence, original, full of fun, ironical, dialectical. Eccarius acted for many years as general secretary of the International Workingmen's Association, on whose General Council we find such names as Eccarius, Pfander, Lessner (1825-1910), Lochner (b. 1826), Marx, my own. Subsequently Eccarius devoted himself entirely to the trade union movement in Britain.*

communes, circles, leading circles, central committee, and congress. It took the name of Communist League. The first article of the convention runs: 'The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the bourgeois social order founded upon class antagonisms, and the inauguration of a new social order wherein there shall be neither classes nor private property.' The organisation was democratic through and through; its officials were elected and were subject to recall. This alone was sufficient to put an end to any hankering to revert to conspiratorial methods, for these require a dictatorship if they are to be successful. Thus, at least in so far as times of peace were concerned, the Federation was transformed into a propaganda society. The new rules—so democratic had we all become—were laid before the 'communes' for discussion. They were further considered at the second congress, and were finally accepted by this body on December 8, 1847. They may be found, printed in full in Wermuth and Stieber's (1818-1882) work on the communist conspiracies of the nineteenth century, Vol. I, p. 239, appendix VIII.*

"The second congress took place during the last days of November and the early days of December of the same year. This time, Marx was present and explained the new theory in the course of a lengthy debate—the congress sat for ten days at the lowest reckoning. Contradiction and doubt were set at rest, the new theory was unanimously accepted, and Marx and I were commissioned to draw up a manifesto. We completed our task without delay. A few weeks before the outbreak of the February revolution, the manuscript was sent to London where it was printed. Since that time it has made the voyage round the world, has been translated into almost every language, and even to this day serves as a guide to the proletarian movement in the most diverse countries. The motto of the Federation: "All men are brothers," was replaced by a new slogan: "Proletarians of all lands, unite." This was a public declaration of the international character of the struggle Seventeen years later this war-cry resounded throughout the world as the watchword of the International Workingmen's Association, and to-day the struggling proletariat in all lands has inscribed it on its banner."

Fresh data and other documents at the disposal of subsequent investigators (Mehring, 1846-1919, Gustav Mayer, and Grunbergh, b. 1861, for instance) have shed fresh light here and there on the picture drawn originally by Engels; but in the main this sketch of his is about as complete as it could be.

Ten years ago, however, a detailed critical analysis of the foregoing introduction to the *Entwurf*, and the supplementing of Engels' account (a record from memory of events long past) with the much earlier data adduced by Marx in his book *Herr Vogt*, led me to the conclusion that the whole history of the Communist League down to 1848, as told by Engels, was a tale intended for the edification of the German social democrats who in the eighties were reverting to much the same position as that of the German communists during the years 1846-1848, and were being forced to carry on their work underground. Under

* See *Rules and Constitution of the Communist League in the Appendix.*

the influence of his didactic mission Engels completely misrepresents the attitude adopted at the time by himself and Marx.*

If we are to believe what Engels says about Moll's visits to Brussels and Paris in 1847, up to that time he and Marx had as regards the working-class movement and the Federation of the Just, been only casual onlookers. Then the leaders of the Federation, convinced of the excellence of Marx's and Engels' views, approached them with the proposal to join the Federation and carry on the work of organisation and enlightenment in a body where previously confusion and eclecticism had reigned supreme.

As a matter of fact Marx and Engels had given practical aid at a much earlier date, but down to 1846 their main activities had been among bourgeois intellectuals. Independent endeavours at organisation among the working class were still foreign to them in those days, and they had contended themselves with making the acquaintance of prominent working-class intellectuals.

Another point in Engels' account is inaccurate. According to him, after the failure of the Paris rising on May 12, 1839, and the flight of Schapper and his comrades to London, the headquarters of the Federation of the Just were transferred to the British metropolis. As a matter of fact we cannot find any trace of the existence of this organisation after 1840; neither reports nor manifestoes that would in the ordinary course of events have been issued in the name of the Federation are to be found. All that is certain is that the sometime members of the Federation during their exile in England and in Switzerland carried on their revolutionary propaganda.

The Workers' Educational Society which was founded by Schapper and his friends was to have served as a screen for the activities of the Federation, but it soon became a centre in itself and attracted various foreigners to its ranks, so that German was more spoken by its members than was English. In August, 1844, Wilhelm Weitling arrived in London after suffering many trials and tribulations at the hands of the Prussian and Swiss authorities, and undergoing various terms of imprisonment. A great festival was held in his honour. Schapper, in the name of the German revolutionists, took an active part in the organisation of this affair, and was heartily assisted by the Owenites and the Chartists. This was the first international gathering on a large scale to take place in London. Close upon its heels followed another demonstration, in which Schapper was again the leading spirit. In October of the same year an international society was founded under the name of Democratic Friends of all Nations. The aims of this organisation were: to bring the revolutionists of all nations into touch one with another; to consolidate the brotherly ties between the nations; and to win political and social rights.

During the summer of 1845, Marx and Engels twice journeyed to England.

**I expounded these conclusions in the "Sovremenny Mir" during 1914, in a series of articles reviewing the Marx-Engels' correspondence.*

In all, they stayed about six weeks, for the most part in Manchester. Marx was collecting materials for the elucidation of his political and economic theories; Engels was preparing his history of the working-class movement in Britain. At an earlier date, in 1842 and in 1844, Marx and Engels had met some of the German and English revolutionists. It is, therefore, probable that in the course of these journeys in the summer of 1845 they would have got into touch with the members of the Whilom Federation and with the leaders of the German Workers' Educational Society, with Schapper and his comrades. In all likelihood they would have made the acquaintance of some of the Chartists, of Harney (1817-1899) for instance, who was one of the leading contributors to the Chartist journal the "Northern Star," and with Ernest Jones (1819-1869), for already at that date both men had strong leanings towards communist theories. They probably met Weitling at this time, for he was living in London, and took an active part in the discussions which were organised among the workers' clubs in that metropolis.

During the years 1845 and 1846, the debates grew at times somewhat heated. This ardour was fostered by the innumerable writings issued by the representatives of the various trends among German socialists and communists. From Engels' letters to Marx we learn how communist groups came into being in certain towns. There was, however, no link between the groups, and no widely read journal which might have kept them in touch one with the other. The groups had a purely working-class membership, without a sprinkling of "bourgeois intellectuals." They were scattered about Germany; in Westphalia, in the Rhine provinces, in Silesia, and in Berlin. "Men of Letters," on the other hand, "intellectuals" with socialist and communist sympathies, had various literary journals at their command, and there they carried on communist propaganda. In this matter they had the advantage over their working-class brethren. But the intellectuals were content to write disquisitions on socialist themes, to appeal exclusively to the "cultured" classes, to eschew all political activity. They felt no need for an all-embracing organisation, nor for getting into touch with the scattered groups of working-class communists in their midst.

Matters took a very different turn when Marx and Engels were able to work out a synthesis between "politics" and socialism, and when, at the same time, they provided an answer to the question as to how the working-class movement could be hitched on to socialism, thereby putting an end to the cleavage which had hitherto existed. They showed that socialism or communism constituted the highest expression of the workers' movement, that communism presupposed complete democracy, that communist society could be established by none other than the working class, and that the whole burden of the inauguration of the new social order must be assumed by the workers, the proletariat. Hence, the task of the workers was to enter the arena with a clear consciousness of the goal they were out to win, and to create an independent political party to represent the workers' interests. Nor must the proletariat shrink from the fulfilment of its mission, it must not withdraw into anchorite cells, or become disintegrated into sects. On the contrary, it must take part in every manifestation of social life,

must learn the lesson which every action is capable of teaching, must take a lively share in all spheres of contemporary life.

It goes without saying that the endeavour to unite the intellectuals and the workers in the communist groups did not run a smooth course. On the one hand, war had to be waged against the old belief in "true socialism," and, on the other, the workers' prejudices had to be overcome and their distrust of "literary gents" dispelled.

An organisational centre had to be created, a focus of propagandist activities, as a step towards the inauguration of a compact, fighting body. The easiest method seemed to be to begin by the unification of the various communist groups in Germany. At that date, these groups were, from an organisational point of view, very similar to the social democratic groups which existed in Russia down to the year 1898.

The summoning of a conference of representatives of all the communist groups was mooted towards the close of the year 1845 and the beginning of 1846.

I had the good fortune to find a copy of the circular wherein the need for such a conference was suggested. The most convenient place of assembly for the German delegates seemed to be Verviers, in Switzerland. Hess was living here; and both Marx and Weitling, whose presence every one considered essential, could journey to that town without inconvenience.

I have not yet been able to ascertain whether the conference planned for the summer of 1846 ever took place. It is probable that the idea went awry because the endeavour to compound the differences between Marx and Weitling came to naught. In May, 1846, Marx and his friends, made renewed and yet fiercer attacks upon Kriege who was one of the most influential exponents of "German" or "true socialism," and was, in company with Weitling, carrying on intensive propaganda among the London groups.

Marx and Engels now conceived the notion of forming special groups of those communists who shared their point of view. A notable phalanx had gathered round the two friends in Brussels. There was Wilhelm Wolff (1809-1864), to whose memory, twenty years later, Marx dedicated the first volume of *Capital*; Sebastian Seiler, Joseph Weydemeyer (died 1866), Philippe Gigot, a Belgian; later on, Tedesco, another Belgian, threw in his lot with the group, and a few workers likewise rallied round. After some hesitation, Hess accepted Marx's conclusions, and joined the little band.

The Brussels group became the chief nucleus for the new communist organisation, which, from the very outset, was to be built upon an international foundation. Marx and Engels hoped to convert Proudhon (1809-1865) to their way of thinking; also they expected the Chartist to join their ranks. Starting from the premise that Europe was on the eve of a fresh outbreak of revolution, which would everywhere carry the bourgeoisie to power and at the same time would prepare the way for the political organisation of the proletariat, they

invited Proudhon to join forces with them in order to be ready when "the moment for action" should arrive—*i.e.*, be ready for the revolution.

Proudhon turned down their invitation. His letter to Marx was full of ambiguities, but it showed clearly how utterly divergent were the views of these two men. We can only look upon his answer to Marx's proposal as an excursion into the realm of literature, pure and simple, unless, as Mehring suggests, we are to label it as a lucubration from a common or garden correspondence bureau!

In 1845, together with fellow Chartists and some of the exiles in London, Harney had founded an international society which had been christened Fraternal Democrats. He assumed a rather sceptical attitude towards Marx's proposals, but promised his adhesion to the new organisation on condition that his friends among the German exiles in London, and above all Schapper, should likewise be invited to join.

It is difficult to explain why Marx and Engels chose the name "Kommunistisches Korrespondenzkomitee" for their new venture. Perhaps they were influenced by memories of the French revolution, when the Jacobin clubs had their "Comites des Correspondances" to keep the clubs in close touch with various towns. Or, again, the English revolutionary societies, the "Corresponding Societies" as they were called, which played so important a part towards the end of the eighteenth century, may have been in their minds. Be that as it may, this Communist Correspondence Committee was certainly not a mere literary and publications bureau.

The committee had not long been set up in Brussels, when a similar body was installed in London. Harney and the more influential members of the German Workers' Club joined the committee. In the autumn of 1846, Engels removed from Brussels to Paris, in order that he might organise a committee on the same lines in the French capital, with the aid of Jung, the compositor, who had lived in Brussels at an earlier date. Engels encountered strenuous opposition, in part from those who had accepted the Proudhonist gospel in the Germanised version of Karl Grün, and in part from the followers of Cabet (1788-1856).

By the summer of 1847 the strength of the newly organised committees was great enough to warrant the calling of a preliminary conference in London. The gathering took place accordingly, and it was here decided to unite the committees into one body called the Communist League. A provisional constitution was drawn up. This was to be discussed in the various committees, and at a future conference was to take definite form. In short, the next conference was to be, as it were, a confession of faith.

Engels' and Marx's letters of this date go to prove that the strife within the committees was by no means quelled after the preliminary conference. Not only were there dissensions in the Paris group where the old time tendencies were still active. Among the Londoners, likewise, disputes were rife, for the communists had to contend, on the one hand, with the Cabet faction, which sponsored

a scheme for emigration, and, on the other, with the followers of Herzen, who championed the cause of bourgeois democracy.

Some light is shed upon these disputes by a perusal of the trial number of a Marxist journal issued by the London members of the Communist League. This "Kommunistische Zeitschrift" was issued in September 1847.* Immediately under the title we read Marx's new slogan: Proletarians of all lands, unite! This watchword was issued six months before the publication of the Communist Manifesto, and was henceforward to replace the device of the Fraternal Democrats which had run: All men are brothers! The contributions are unsigned. The article outlining the program or policy of the League was probably written in collaboration by the London members, Schapper and his friends. Towards the close we find a summons to the proletarians of all lands to unite, "openly where the laws permit, for our activities need not fear the light of day; secretly where the arbitrary will of tyrants imposes secrecy upon us."

The second article analyses minutely Cabet's scheme of emigration, and rejects it. A third article, in all probability written by Engels, draws a characteristic portrait of the political situation in Prussia. The issue concludes with a "political and social survey," wherein it is easy to detect the style of Wilhelm Wolff.

The second congress of the League took place in November-December 1847. After a protracted debate, the new rules were adopted, and it was decided at Engel's suggestion, that, instead of issuing a "profession of faith," the League should publish a "Manifesto of the Communist Party." Marx was commissioned to draw up this document, although other "professions of faith," one of them drafted by Engels, had been presented to the congress. Needless to say, Marx profited by all the assistance his friend was able to give him. When we compare the Manifesto with the sketch by Engels (which was subsequently published by Bernstein and which is republished in translation here under the title *Principles of Communism*, in the appendix,) we realise how right Engels was when, writing after Marx's death, he declared in his preface to a new issue of the Manifesto that "the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus belongs to Marx." Certainly, too, the view of the Congress was that Marx was to be the responsible author of the Manifesto. This is made clear by the letter from the Central Committee in London to the regional committee in Brussels, under date January 26, 1848. The resolution adopted on the same date and communicated in the letter was occasioned by the fact that Marx, as was his custom, was giving an excessive amount of time to the elaboration of his work, and was thus delaying publication.

* A short while ago it was reprinted by Dr. Carl Grunberg, professor at Vienna University. A copy of the journal, the property of Friedrich Lessner, who was a member of the Communist League and an intimate friend of Marx and Engels, fell into my hands in 1912. The document is now housed in the Marx-Engels Institute at Moscow. A full translation of the text will be found among the appendixes to this book.

"The Central Committee charges its regional committee in Brussels to communicate with Citizen Marx, and to tell him that if the Manifesto of the Communist Party, the writing of which he undertook to do at the recent congress, does not reach London by February 1st of the current year, further measures will have to be taken against him. In the event of Citizen Marx not fulfilling his task, the Central Committee requests the immediate return of the documents placed at Citizen Marx's disposal.

"In the name of and by order of the Central Committee,

"SCHAPPER, BAUER, MOLL."*

There was good cause for the angry tenor of this note. The distant rumblings of the coming revolutionary storm could already be heard. In the beginning of January, matters had come to a head in northern Italy. On January 12th, an open revolt had broken out in Sicily and in Palermo, and a provisional government had been set up. Any day might see the outbreak of revolution in France. Indeed, the Manifesto was actually in the last stages of publication when the February insurrection occurred in Paris. The first copies of the Manifesto entered Germany a few weeks after the March revolution in that country. The Manifesto had been heralded there by another publication entitled "The Demands of the Communist Party" drawn up by the newly formed committee of the League. When the revolution broke out, the London group (which according to the rules of the League was to act as Central Committee) transferred its powers to the Brussels group. But now the leading members of this group were expelled from Brussels, and were obliged to take up their residence in Paris. Marx was among the number. Here they came into conflict with the German democratic refugees who were plotting an armed invasion of Germany. Ultimately, however, the members of the Brussels group found their way to their several homes.

During the disturbances of the year 1848, the Communist League played a very insignificant part, for it was still in the initial stages of organisation. Least of all was its influence felt in France, where those who had sympathies with its aims were absorbed into the ranks of the Blanquists, and where all the revolutionists suffered a common defeat in May 1848. In England, where Harney and Jones were doing propaganda work among the Chartist, the defeat of the London democrats on April 10th, and of the Paris proletariat in the following June, rallied all the forces of the bourgeoisie against the revolution, and detached nearly all the petty-bourgeois sympathisers from the Chartist cause. A more or less important part was played by individual members of the League in Germany, but in no case did they act as representatives of the Communist League.

The defeat of the German and the Austrian revolutions in May and in June 1849 respectively, caused many of the old members of the League to seek refuge in Switzerland and in France. Then, after the defeat of Ledru-Rollin's party in Paris, they fled to England. An endeavour was made in London to resurrect the

* This communication was discovered by myself and handed to Comrade Mehring for publication.

organisation, but the attempt proved abortive owing to the very strong diversity of opinion as to tactics. There were, above all, the veterans, Schapper and Willich (1810-1878), dreaming of fresh revolutions taking place anywhere and everywhere, now, without delay. Marx and Engels, at the head of the majority of the revolutionists in London, made every attempt to link up with the Germans, but without success.

Nothjung (1821-1880), an emissary of the Communist League, was arrested in Leipzig on May 19, 1851; soon after this event, the central committee in Cologne was raided. The communists who were arrested in this connection (Friedrich Lessner was among the company), were kept in prison for eighteen months awaiting trial. The trial lasted from October 4, 1852, to the twelfth of November following. The accused were sentenced to from three to six years' imprisonment. After this judgment the League decided to disband.

Twelve years were to elapse before the workers' movement was again strong enough to form an international organisation. Then the initiative was taken by the French and English workers, but the task of formulating the rules and constitution of the International Workingmen's Association fell to Marx's lot. The new International, or First International as it is usually called, was founded in London on September 28, 1864, and during the ensuing decade its members were the motive force behind the whole of the European and American working-class movement.

At the congress of Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), and Basle (1869), the fundamentals of a program for the working class were thrashed out between French Proudhonists, British trade unionists, and German Marxists. The struggle between the "physical-force anarchists," Bakunin (1814-1876) and his followers, and the Marxists, began in 1868, and came to a head at the Hague Congress (1872) after the defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871. The General Council was transferred to New York after Hague Congress, and during four-years continued its work as best it might. The International then officially ceased to exist.

Twelve years later, the workers' movement having once more acquired strength and having adopted the principles laid down in the Communist Manifesto, it was felt that the time had come to organise once more on an international scale. In July 1889, therefore, the Second International was founded in Paris. For twenty-five years this body accomplished an enormous task in organising the international proletariat, only to capitulate ignominiously to the bourgeoisie at the outbreak of the great war in August 1914.

D. RYAZANOFF.

PART ONE

Manifesto of the Communist Party

ASPECTRE haunts Europe—the spectre of communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance in order to lay this spectre : pope and tsar; Metternich and Guizot; French radicals and German police¹.

Where is the opposition party which has not been stigmatised as communist by those who wield power? Where is the opposition party which has not hurled back this scandalous charge of communism in the teeth of its adversaries, whether progressive or reactionary?

Two things may be deduced from this :

1. Communism is already acknowledged by all the European powers to be itself a power.

2. It is time for the communists to make open proclamation of their outlook, their aims, their trends; and to confront the old wives' tale of a communist spectre with a manifesto of their own party.

To this end, communists of various nationalities have foregathered in London and² have drafted the following manifesto, which will be published in English, French, German, Italian, Flemish, and Danish.

I

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS

THE history of all human society,² past and present, has been the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, baron and serf, guild-burgess and journeyman—in a word, oppressor and oppressed—stood in sharp opposition each to the other. They carried on perpetual warfare, sometimes masked, sometimes open and acknowledged; a warfare that invariably ended, either in a revolutionary change in the whole structure of society, or else in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complete subdivision of society into different ranks, a manifold

¹ For this and all numbered references in text see Explanatory Notes, P. 70 et. seq.

gradation of social positions. In ancient Rome, we have : patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves. In the Middle Ages, we have : feudal lords, vassals, guild-burgesses, journeymen, serfs; and within each of these classes there existed, in almost every instance, further gradations.

Modern bourgeois society, rising out of the ruins of feudal society, did not make an end of class antagonisms. It merely set up new classes in place of the old; new conditions of oppression; new embodiments of struggle.

Our own age, the bourgeois age, is distinguished by this—that it has simplified class antagonisms. More and more, society is splitting into two great hostile camps, into two great and directly contraposed classes : bourgeoisie and proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the burgesses of the first towns; and from these burgesses sprang the first elements of the bourgeoisie.

The discovery of America and the circumnavigation of Africa opened up new fields to the rising bourgeoisie. The East Indian and the Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the multiplication of the means of exchange and of commodities in general, gave an unprecedented impetus to commerce, navigation, and manufacturing industry, thus fostering the growth of the revolutionary element in decaying feudal society.³

Hitherto industrial production had been carried on by the guilds that had grown up in feudal society; but this method could not cope with the increasing demands of the new markets. Manufacture replaced guild production. The guildsmen were elbowed out of the way by the industrial middle class; the division of labour between the various guilds or corporations was superseded by the division of labour in the individual workshop.⁴

The expansion of the markets continued, for demand was perpetually increasing. Even manufacture was no longer able to cope with it. Then steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. Manufacture was replaced by modern large-scale industry [machinofacture]; the place of the industrial middle class was taken by the industrial millionaires, the chiefs of fully equipped industrial armies, the modern bourgeoisie.

Large-scale industry established the world market, for which the discovery of America had paved the way. The result of the develop-

ment of the world market was an immeasurable growth of commerce, navigation and land communication. These changes reacted in their turn upon industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation and railways expanded, so did the bourgeoisie develop, increasing its capitalised resources and forcing into the background all the classes that lingered on as relics from the Middle Ages.⁵

Thus we see that the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the methods of production and the means of communication.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance. An oppressed class under the dominion of the feudal lords, it became an armed and self-governing association in the commune; here an independent urban republic, there the taxable "third estate" under the monarchy; in the days of manufacture, the bourgeoisie was the counterpoise of the nobility in the semi-feudal or in the absolute monarchy and was the corner-stone of the great monarchies in general—to fight its way upwards, in the end, after the rise of large-scale industry and the establishment of the world market, to exclusive political hegemony in the modern representative State. The modern State authority is nothing more than a committee for the administration of the consolidated affairs of the bourgeois class as a whole.⁶

The bourgeoisie has played an extremely revolutionary role upon the stage of history.

Wherever the bourgeoisie has risen to power, it has destroyed all feudal, patriarchal, and idyllic relationships. It has ruthlessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound men to their "natural superiors"; it has left no other bond betwixt man and man but crude self-interest and unfeeling "cash payment." It has drowned pious zeal, chivalrous enthusiasm, and humdrum sentimentalism in the chill waters of selfish calculation. It has degraded personal dignity to the level of exchange value; and in place of countless dearly-bought chartered freedoms, it has set up one solitary unscrupulous freedom—freedom of trade. In a word, it has replaced exploitation veiled in religious and political illusions by exploitation that is open, unashamed, direct, and brutal.⁷

The bourgeoisie has robbed of their haloes various occupations hitherto regarded with awe and veneration. Doctor, lawyer, priest, poet, and scientist, have become its wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn the veil of sentiment from the family relationship, which has become an affair of money and nothing more.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed that the brute force of the Middle Ages (that brute force so greatly admired by the reactionaries) found a fitting counterpart in excessive indolence. The bourgeoisie was the first to show us what human activity is capable of achieving. It has executed works more marvellous than the building of Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has carried out expeditions surpassing by far the tribal migrations and the Crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without incessantly revolutionising the instruments of production; and, consequently, the relations of production; and, therefore, the totality of social relations. Conversely, for all earlier industrial classes, the preservation of the old methods of production was the first condition of existence. That which characterises the bourgeois epoch in contradistinction to all others is a continuous transformation of production, a perpetual disturbance of social conditions, everlasting insecurity and movement. All stable and stereotyped relations, with their attendant train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, and the newly formed becomes obsolete before it can petrify. All that has been regarded as solid, crumbles into fragments; all that was looked upon as holy, is profaned; at long last, people are compelled to gaze open-eyed at their position in life and their social relations.⁸

Urged onward by the need for an ever-expanding market, the bourgeoisie invades every quarter of the globe. It occupies every corner; forms settlements and sets up means of communication here, there, and everywhere.⁹

By the exploitation of the world market, the bourgeoisie has given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every land. To the despair of the reactionaries, it has deprived industry of its national foundation. Of the old-established national industries, some have already been destroyed and others are day by day undergoing destruction. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction is becoming a matter of life and death for all civilised nations: by industries which no longer depend upon the homeland for their raw materials, but draw these from the remotest spots; and by industries whose products are consumed, not only in the country of manufacture, but the wide world over. Instead of the old wants, satisfied by the products of native industry, new wants appear, wants which can only

be satisfied by the products of distant lands and unfamiliar climes. The old local and national self-sufficiency and isolation are replaced by a system of universal intercourse, of all-round interdependence of the nations. We see this in intellectual production no less than in material. The intellectual products of each nation are now the common property of all. National exclusiveness and particularism are fast becoming impossible. Out of the manifold national and local literatures, a world literature arises.¹⁰

By rapidly improving the means of production and by enormously facilitating communication, the bourgeoisie drags all the nations even the most barbarian, into the orbit of civilisation. Cheap wares form the heavy artillery with which it batters down Chinese walls and compels the most obstinate of barbarians to overcome their hatred of the foreigner. It forces all the nations, under pain of extinction, to adopt the capitalist method of production; it constrains them to accept what is called civilisation, to become bourgeois themselves. In short, it creates a world after its own image.¹¹

The bourgeoisie has subjected the countryside to the rule of the town. It has brought huge cities into being, vastly increasing the urban population as compared with the rural, and thus removing a large proportion of the inhabitants from the seclusion and ignorance of rural life. Moreover, just as it has made the country dependent on the town, so it has made the barbarian and the semi-barbarian nations dependent upon the civilised nations, the peasant peoples upon the industrial peoples, the East upon the West.¹²

More and ever more, the bourgeoisie puts an end to the fractionisation of the means of production, of property, and of population. It has agglomerated population, centralised the means of production, and concentrated ownership into the hands of the few. Political centralisation has necessarily ensued. Independent or loosely federated provinces, with disparate interests, laws, governments, and customs tariffs, have been consolidated into a single nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class interest, one fiscal frontier.¹³

During its reign of scarce a century, the bourgeoisie has created more powerful, more stupendous forces of production than all preceding generations rolled into one. The subjugation of the forces of nature, the invention of machinery, the application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steamships, railways, electric telegraphs, the clearing of whole continents for cultivation, the making of navigable waterways,

huge populations springing up as if by magic out of the earth—what earlier generations had the remotest inkling that such productive powers slumbered within the womb of associated labour ?¹⁴

We have seen that the means of production and communication which served as the foundation for the development of the bourgeoisie, had been generated in feudal society. But the time came, at a certain stage in the development of these means of production and communication, when the conditions under which the production and the exchange of goods were carried on in feudal society, when the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacture, when (in a word) feudal property relations, were no longer adequate for the productive forces as now developed. They hindered production instead of helping it. They had become fetters on production; they had to be broken; they were broken.

Their place was taken by free competition, in conjunction with the social and political system appropriate to free competition—the economic and political dominance of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on under our very eyes. Bourgeois conditions of production and communication; bourgeois property relations; modern bourgeois society, which has conjured up such mighty means of production and communication—these are like a magician who is no longer able to control the spirits his spells have summoned from the nether world. For decades, the history of industry and commerce has been nothing other than the history of the rebellion of the modern forces of production against the contemporary conditions of production, against the property relations which are essential to the life and the supremacy of the bourgeoisie. Enough to mention the commercial crises which, in their periodic recurrence, become more and more menacing to the existence of bourgeois society. These commercial crises periodically lead to the destruction of a great part, not only of the finished products of industry, but also of the extant forces of production. During the crisis, a social epidemic breaks out, an epidemic that would have seemed absurdly paradoxical in all earlier phases of the world's history—an epidemic of overproduction. Temporarily, society relapses into barbarism. It is as if a famine, or a universal, devastating war, had suddenly cut off the means of subsistence. Industry and commerce have, to all seeming, been utterly destroyed. Why is this ? Because society has too much civilisation, too abundant means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive

forces at the disposal of the community no longer serve to foster bourgeois property relations. Having grown too powerful for these relations, they are hampered thereby; and when they overcome the obstacle, they spread disorder throughout bourgeois society and endanger the very existence of bourgeois property. The bourgeois system is no longer able to cope with the abundance of the wealth it creates. How does the bourgeoisie overcome these crises? On the one hand by the compulsory annihilation of a quantity of the productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets and the more thorough exploitation of old ones. With what results? The results are that the way is paved for more wide-spread and more disastrous crises and that the capacity for averting such crises is lessened.¹⁵

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie overthrew feudalism are now being turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But the bourgeoisie has not only forged the weapons that will slay it; it has also engendered the men who will use these weapons—the modern workers, the PROLETARIANS. *begin, bring about*

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, that is to say capital, has developed, in the same proportion has the proletariat developed—the modern working class, the class of those who can only live so long as their work increases capital. These workers, who are forced to sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity like any other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition and to all the fluctuations of the market.¹⁶

Owing to the ever more extended use of machinery and the division of labour, the work of these proletarians has completely lost its individual character and therewith has forfeited all its charm for the workers.¹⁷ The worker has become a mere appendage to a machine; a person from whom nothing but the simplest, the most monotonous, and the most easily learned manipulations are expected. The cost of production of a worker therefore amounts to little more than the cost of the means of subsistence he needs for his upkeep and for the propagation of his race. Now, the price of a commodity, labour not excepted, is equal to the cost of producing it. Wages therefore decrease in proportion as the repulsiveness of the labour increases. Nay more; in proportion as the use of machinery and the division of labour increases, so does the burden of labour increase—whether by the prolongation of working hours or by an increase in the amount of work exacted

from the wage-earner in a given time (as by speeding-up the machinery, etc.).¹⁸

Modern industry has transformed the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the huge factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of workers, crowded together in the factory, are organised in military fashion. As rankers in the industrial army, they are placed under the supervision of a hierarchy of non-commissioned and commissioned officers. They are not merely the slaves of the bourgeois class, of the bourgeois State; they are in daily and hourly thralldom to the machine, to the foreman, and, above all, to the individual bourgeois manufacturer. The more frankly this despotism avows gain to be its object, the more petty, odious, and galling does it become.¹⁹

In proportion as manual labour needs less skill and less strength, that is to say in proportion as modern industry develops, so the work of women and children tends to replace the work of men. Differences of age and sex no longer have any social significance for the working class. All are now mere instruments of labour, whose price varies according to age and sex.²⁰

When the worker has been paid his wages in hard cash, and, for the nonce, has escaped from exploitation by the factory owner, he is promptly set upon by other members of the bourgeoisie: landlord, shopkeeper, pawnbroker, etc.²¹

Those who have hitherto belonged to the lower middle class—small manufacturers, small traders, minor recipients of unearned income, handicraftsmen, and peasants—slip down, one and all, into the proletariat. They suffer this fate, partly because their petty capital is insufficient for the needs of large-scale industry and perishes in competition with the superior means of the great capitalists, and partly because their specialised skill is rendered valueless owing to the invention of new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.²²

The proletariat passes through various stages of evolution, but its struggle against the bourgeoisie dates from its birth.

To begin with, the workers fight individually; then the workers in a single factory make common cause; then the workers at one trade combine throughout a whole locality against the particular bourgeois who exploits them. Their attacks are levelled, not only against bourgeois conditions of production, but also against the actual instruments

of production; they destroy the imported wares which compete with the products of their own labour, they break up machinery, they set factories ablaze, they strive to regain the lost position of the medieval worker.²³

At this stage the workers form a disunited mass, scattered throughout the country, and severed into fragments by mutual competition. Such aggregation as occurs among them is not, so far, the outcome of their own inclination to unite, but is a consequence of the union of the bourgeoisie, which, for its own political purposes, must set the whole proletariat in motion, and can still do so at times. At this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their own enemies; they attack the enemies of their enemies: the remnants of the absolute monarchy, the landlords, the non-industrial bourgeois, and the petty bourgeois. The whole historical movement is thus concentrated into the hands of the bourgeoisie: and every victory so gained is a bourgeois victory.²⁴

As industry develops, the proletariat does not merely increase in numbers: it is compacted into larger masses, its strength grows, it is more aware of that strength. Within the proletariat, interests and conditions of life become ever more equalised; for machinery obliterates more and more the distinctions between the various crafts, and forces wages down almost everywhere to the same low level. As a result of increasing competition among the bourgeois themselves, and of the consequent commercial crises, the workers' wages fluctuate more and more. The steadily accelerating improvement in machinery makes their livelihood increasingly precarious; more and more, the collisions between individual workers and individual bourgeois tend to assume the character of collisions between the respective classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form coalitions against the bourgeois, closing their ranks in order to maintain the rate of wages. They found durable associations which will be able to give them support whenever the struggle grows acute. Here and there, this struggle takes the form of riots.²⁵

From time to time the workers are victorious, though their victory is fleeting. The real fruit of their battles is not the immediate success, but their own continually increasing unification. Unity is furthered by the improvement in the means of communication which is effected by large-scale industry and which brings the workers of different localities into closer contact. Nothing more is needed to centralise

the manifold local contests, which are all of the same type, into a national contest, a class struggle. Every class struggle is a political struggle. The medieval burghers, whose means of communication were at best the roughest of roads, took centuries to achieve unity. Thanks to railways, the modern proletariat can join forces within a few years.²⁶

This organisation of the proletarians to form a class and therewith to form a political party, is perpetually being disintegrated by competition among the workers themselves. Yet it is incessantly reformed, becoming stronger, firmer, mightier. Profiting by dissensions among the bourgeoisie, it compels legislative recognition of some of the specifically working-class interests. That is how the Ten Hours Bill was secured in England.

Dissensions within the old order of society do much to promote the development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie is ever at odds : at first with the aristocracy ; then with those sections of the bourgeoisie whose interests conflict with the progress of industry ; and at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign lands. In these struggles, it is forced to appeal to the proletariat, to claim the help of the workers, and thus to draw them into the political arena. Consequently, the bourgeoisie hands on the elements of education to the proletariat, thus supplying weapons which will be turned against itself.

Furthermore, as we have seen, the advance of industry precipitates whole sections of the ruling class into the proletariat, or at least imperils their livelihood. These recruits to the proletariat also bring enlightenment into the ranks.

Finally, when the class war is about to be fought to a finish, disintegration of the ruling class and the old order of society becomes so active, so acute, that a small part of the ruling class breaks away to make common cause with the revolutionary class, the class which holds the future in its hands. Just as in former days part of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now part of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat. Especially does this happen in the case of some of the bourgeois ideologists, who have achieved a theoretical understanding of the historical movement as a whole.²⁷

Among all the classes that confront the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is really revolutionary. Other classes decay and perish with the rise of large-scale industry, but the proletariat is the most characteristic product of that industry.

The lower middle class—small manufacturers, small traders, handicraftsmen, peasant proprietors—one and all fight the bourgeoisie in the hope of safeguarding their existence as sections of the middle class. They are, therefore, not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more; they are reactionary, for they are trying to make the wheels of history turn backwards. If they ever become revolutionary, it is only because they are afraid of slipping down into the ranks of the proletariat; they are not defending their present interests, but their future interests; they are forsaking their own standpoint, in order to adopt that of the proletariat.

The slum proletariat, which is formed by the putrefaction of the lowest strata of the old society, is to some extent entangled in the movement of a proletarian revolution. On the whole, however, thanks to their conditions of life, the members of the slum proletariat are far more apt to become the venal tools of the forces of reaction.²⁸

For the proletariat, nothing is left of the social conditions that prevailed in the old society. The proletarian has no property; his relation to wife and children is utterly different from the family relations of bourgeois life; modern industrial labour, the modern enslavement by capital (the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany), has despoiled him of his national characteristics. Law, morality, and religion have become for him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which bourgeois interests lurk in ambush.²⁹

The classes that have hitherto won to power have tried to safeguard their newly acquired position by subjecting society at large to the conditions by which they themselves gained their possessions. But the only way in which proletarians can get control of the productive forces of society is by making an end of their own previous method of acquisition, and therewith of all the extant methods of acquisition. Proletarians have nothing of their own to safeguard; it is their business to destroy all pre-existent private proprietary securities and private proprietary safeguards.

All earlier movements have been movements of minorities, or movements in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is an independent movement of the overwhelming majority in the interest of that majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of extant society, cannot raise itself, cannot stand erect upon its feet, without disrupting

the whole superstructure comprising the strata which make up that society.

In form, though not in substance, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is primarily national. Of course, in any country, the proletariat has first of all to settle accounts with its own bourgeoisie.

In this outline sketch of the phases of proletarian development, we have traced the course of the civil war (which, though more or less concealed, goes on within extant society), have traced that civil war to the point at which it breaks out into open revolution, the point at which the proletariat, by forcibly overthrowing the bourgeoisie, establishes its own dominion.³⁰

As we have seen, all human society, past and present, has been based upon the antagonism between oppressing and oppressed classes. But before a class can be oppressed it must have a modicum of security for its vital conditions, so that within these it can at least carry on its slavish existence. In the days of serfdom, the serf worked his way up to membership of the commune; in like manner, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, the petty burgher became a bourgeois. But the modern worker, instead of rising as industry develops, sinks ever lower in the scale, and even falls into conditions of existence below those proper to his own class. The worker is becoming a pauper, and pauperism is increasing even more rapidly than population and wealth. This plainly shows that the bourgeoisie is no longer fitted to be the ruling class in society or to impose its own social system as supreme law for society at large. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to provide security for its slaves even within the confines of their slavish existence; because it has no option but to let them lapse into a condition in which it has to feed them instead of being fed by them. Society cannot continue to live under bourgeois rule. This means that the life of the bourgeoisie has become incompatible with the life of society.

The chief requisite for the existence and the rule of the bourgeoisie is the accumulation of wealth in the hands of private individuals; the formation and increase of capital. The chief requisite for capital is wage labour. Now, wage labour depends exclusively upon competition among the workers. The progress of industry, which the bourgeoisie involuntarily and passively promotes, substitutes for the isolation of the workers by mutual competition their revolutionary unification by association. Thus the development of large-scale industry cuts from

under the feet of the bourgeoisie the ground upon which capitalism controls production and appropriates the products of labour. Before all, therefore, the bourgeoisie produces its own gravediggers. Its downfall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.³¹

II.

PROLETARIANS AND COMMUNISTS

What position do communists occupy in relation to the general body of proletarians?

Communists do not form a separate party conflicting with other working-class parties.

They have no interests apart from those of the working class as a whole.

They do not put forward any sectarian principles in accordance with which they wish to mould the proletarian movement.

The only ways in which the communists are distinguished from other proletarian parties are these: on the one hand, in the various national struggles of the proletarians, they emphasise and champion the interests of the proletariat as a whole, those proletarian interests that are independent of nationality; and, on the other hand, in the various phases of evolution through which the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie passes, they always advocate the interests of the movement as a whole.

Thus, in actual practice, communists form the most resolute and persistently progressive section of the working class parties of all lands whilst, as far as theory is concerned, being in advance of the general mass of the proletariat, they have come to understand the determinants of the proletarian movement and how to foresee its course and its general results.

The communists' immediate aims are identical with those of all other proletarian parties: organisation of the proletariat on a class basis; destruction of bourgeois supremacy; conquest of political power by the proletariat.³²

The theories of the communists are not in any way based upon ideas or principles discovered or established by this or that universal reformer.

They serve merely to express in general terms the concrete circumstances of an actually existing class struggle, of a historical movement that is going on under our very eyes. The abolition of pre-existent property relations is not a process exclusively characteristic of communism.

Throughout the course of history, all property relations have been subject to continuous change, unceasing transformation.

For instance, the French revolution abolished the feudal system of ownership and put the bourgeois system of ownership in its place.

The distinctive feature of communism is, not the abolition of property in general, but the abolition of bourgeois property.

Modern bourgeois property is, however, the final and most perfect expression of the method of production and appropriation which is based upon class conflicts, upon the spoliation of the many by the few.

In this sense, communists can sum up their theory in the pithy phrase: the abolition of private property.

We communists have been accused of wishing to abolish the property that has been acquired by personal exertion; the property that is supposed to be the foundation of individual liberty, activity, and independence.

Hard-won property, acquired by work; earned property! Are you talking about the petty-bourgeois or petty-peasant property which was the antecedent of bourgeois property? We do not need to abolish that kind of property, for industrial development has abolished it, or is doing so day by day.³³

Perhaps you are referring to modern bourgeois private property?

Does wage labour create property for the proletarianised worker? Not at all. It creates capital; and capital is the property which exploits wage labour, the property which can multiply itself—provided always that it produces a fresh supply of wage labour for further exploitation. Property in its contemporary form subsists upon the antagonism between capital and wage labour. Let us examine the two terms of this opposition.

The capitalist has, not merely a personal, but also a social position in the field of production. Capital is a collective product. It can only be set in motion by the joint activities of many members of society—

in the last resort only by the joint activities of all the members of society.

Thus capital is not a personal, but a social force.

Consequently, when capital is transformed into collective property, into property that belongs to all the members of society, the change is not effected by an transformation of private property into social property. The only change is in the social character of the property, which loses its class characteristics.³⁴

Now let us turn to wage labour.

The average price of wage labour is the minimum wage. This means the amount of the necessities of life requisite to keep the worker alive as a worker. Therefore all that the worker can appropriate thanks to his activity suffices merely to support his bare existence and to reproduce his kind. We have no wish to abolish this personal appropriation of the product of labour, which is indispensable for the production of the immediate necessities of life—an appropriation which does not leave any surplus that can be used as a means for wielding power over another's labour. All that we want to abolish is the deplorable character of this appropriation, of the system under which the worker lives only to increase capital, lives only in so far as his life serves the interest of the ruling class.³⁵

In bourgeois society, living labour is but a means for increasing the amount of stored labour. In communist society, stored labour is but a means for enlarging, enriching, furthering the existence of the workers.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past rules the present; but in communist society the present rules the past. In bourgeois society, capital is independent and has individuality, whereas the living person is dependent and lacks individuality.

Yet the bourgeoisie declares that to make an end of this state of affairs means to make an end of individuality and freedom! That is true enough. Certainly we are concerned to make an end of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom.³⁶

Within the framework of the bourgeois system of production, freedom means free trade, free buying and selling.

Of course, when trade disappears, free trade will disappear too. Chatter about free trade, like all the rest of the tall talk about freedom, has a meaning only as regards the trade that was not free, as regards

the enslaved burgher of the Middle Ages. It has no bearing upon the communist abolition of trade, upon the communist abolition of the bourgeois system of production and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are outraged because we wish to abolish private property. But, in extant society, private property has been abolished for nine-tenths of the population; it exists only because these nine-tenths have ~~none~~ of it. Thus you reproach us for wanting to abolish a form of property which can only exist on condition that the immense majority of the members of the community have no property at all.

In a word, you accuse us of wanting to abolish *your* property. Well, we do!

Your contention is that the individual will cease to exist from the moment when labour can no longer be transformed into capital, money, landrent; from the moment, in short, when it can no longer be transformed into a monopolisable social power; from the moment, that is to say, when individual property can no longer become bourgeois property.

You admit, therefore, that when you speak of individuals you are thinking solely of bourgeois, of the owners of bourgeois property. Certainly we wish to abolish individuals of that kind!³⁷

Communism does not deprive any one of the power of appropriating social products. It only does away with the power of turning that appropriation to account as a means for the subjugation of another's labour.

The objection has been made that the abolition of private property will lead to the cessation of all activity and to the prevalence of universal sloth.

If this were true, bourgeois society would long since have perished of indolence; for in that society those who work do not acquire property, and those who acquire property do not work. The whole criticism amounts to nothing more than the tautologous statement that when there is no more capital there will be no more wage labour.³⁸

All the objections that have been urged against the communist method of producing and distributing material products, have likewise been urged against the communist method of producing and distributing mental products. Just as for the bourgeois the disappearance of class property is tantamount to the disappearance of production, so for him, the disappearance of class culture is identical with the disappearance of culture as a whole.

The culture whose loss he bewails is, for the overwhelming majority, a culture which makes human beings into machines.³⁹

Please do not argue with us by using your bourgeois notions of liberty, culture, right, etc., as the standards by which to judge the abolition of bourgeois property. Your ideas are themselves the outcome of bourgeois methods of production and of bourgeois property relations; just as your "right" is only the will of your class writ large as law—a will whose trends are determined by the material conditions under which your class lives.

Your interests lead you to think that your methods of production, your property relations, are eternal laws of nature and reason, instead of being transient outcomes of the course of production. Earlier ruling classes, now fallen from power, shared this delusion. You understand that it was a delusion as regards the property of classical days, and as regards the property of feudal days; but you cannot see that it is no less a delusion as regards bourgeois property.⁴⁰

Abolition of the family! Even the extreme radicals hold up their hands in horror when they speak of this shameful communist proposal.

On what is the family, the bourgeois family, based to-day? On capital, on private gain. In its fully developed form, it exists only for the bourgeoisie, and it has two complements: one of these is the destruction of the family life of proletarians; the other is public prostitution.

Of course the bourgeois family will disappear with the disappearance of its complements, and the family and its complements will vanish when capital vanishes.

Do you reproach us for wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? We plead guilty to the charge!

Our determination to replace domestic education by social, implies (you declare) a disregard of the most sacred of relationships.

But the education you provide, is it not socially determined? Is it not determined by the social conditions within whose framework you educate? Is it not determined directly or indirectly by society, acting through the schools, etc.? The influence of society upon education was not an original discovery of communists! They merely propose to change the character of the process, by withdrawing education from the influence of the ruling class.

Bourgeois phrasemaking about the family and education, about the intimate relations between parents and children, becomes more and more nauseating in proportion as the development of large-scale industry severs all the family ties of proletarians, and in proportion as proletarian children are transformed into mere articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

"But you communists want to make women common property!" shrieks the bourgeois chorus.

The bourgeois regards his wife as nothing but an instrument of production. He is told that the means of production are to be utilised in common. How can he help thinking that this implies the communisation of women as well as other things?

He never dreams for a moment that our main purpose is to ensure that women shall no longer occupy the position of mere instruments of production.

Besides, nothing could be more absurd than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois as regards the official communisation of women which the communists are supposed to advocate. Communists do not need to introduce community of women; it has almost invariably existed.

The members of the bourgeoisie, not content with having the wives and daughters of proletarians at their disposal (to say nothing of public prostitution), find one of their chief pleasures in seducing one another's wives!

Bourgeois marriage is in actual fact the community of wives. At worst, communists can only be charged with wanting to replace a hypocritical and concealed community of women by an official and frankly acknowledged community. Moreover, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production will lead to the disappearance of that form of the community of women which results therefrom—to the disappearance of official and unofficial prostitution.⁴¹

Communists have likewise been accused of wanting to do away with country, with nationality.

The workers have no country. No one can take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all win political power, must make itself the ruling class, must raise itself to the position of a national class, must establish itself as the nation—it is, so far, still national, though by no means in the bourgeois sense of the term.

National distinctions and contrasts are already tending to

disappear more and more as the bourgeoisie develops, as free trade becomes more general, as the world market grows in size and importance, as manufacturing processes and the resulting conditions of life become more uniform.

The rule of the proletariat will efface these distinctions and contrasts even more. United action, among civilized countries at least, is one of the first of the conditions requisite for the emancipation of the workers.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another comes to an end, the exploitation of one nation by another will come to an end.

The ending of class oppositions within the nations will end the mutual hostilities of the nations.⁴²

The charges brought against communism upon religious or philosophical grounds, or (in general terms) upon ideological grounds, are not worth detailed consideration.

• Is much perspicacity needed to understand that when changes occur in peoples' mode of life, in their social relations or social system, there will also be changes in their ideas and outlooks and conceptions—in a word, that their consciousness will change?

What does the history of ideas prove, if not that mental production changes concomitantly with material production? In every epoch, the ruling ideas have been the ideas of the ruling class.

It is customary to speak of ideas which revolutionise a whole society. This is only another way of saying that the elements of a new society have formed within the old one; that the break-up of the old ideas has kept pace with the break-up of the old social relations.

When the classical world was in its decline, the old religions were conquered by Christianity. When Christian ideas were put to flight by eighteenth-century rationalism, it was at the time when feudal society was fighting for very existence against the bourgeoisie, which was then the revolutionary class. The abstract ideas termed "freedom of conscience" and "religious liberty" were but the expression of the supremacy of free competition within the realm of knowledge.⁴³

The objector will say:

"It is true that religious, moral, philosophical, political, and legal

notions have undergone changes in the course of historical development. Nevertheless (amid these changes), religion, morality, philosophy, political science and law have persisted.

"Besides, there are eternal truths, such as liberty, justice, and the like, which are common to all social systems. But communism repudiates eternal truths, repudiates religion and morality instead of re-fashioning them, and is thus at odds with the whole course of historical evolution."

What does this accusation amount to? The history of all human society, past and present, has been the history of class antagonisms, and these have taken different forms in different epochs.

Whatever form it may have assumed, the exploitation of one part of society by the other has been a fact common to all past ages. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of all the ages (despite manifold variations) has moved along lines of thought common to them all, along lines of thought that will necessarily persist until class oppositions have vanished from the face of the earth.

The communist revolution is the most radical breach with traditional property relations. Need we be surprised that it should imply a no less radical breach with traditional ideas?⁴⁴

Enough of these bourgeois objections to communism !

We have already seen that the first step in the workers' revolution is to make the proletariat the ruling class, to establish democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy in order, by degrees, to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all the means of production into the hands of the State (this meaning the proletariat organised as ruling class), and, as rapidly as possible, to increase the total mass of productive forces.⁴⁵

In the first instance, of course, this can only be effected by despotic inroads upon the rights of property and by despotic interference with bourgeois methods of production; that is to say by measures which seem economically inadequate and untenable, but have far-reaching effects, and are necessary as means for revolutionising the whole system of production.

These measures will naturally differ from country to country.

In the most advanced countries they will generally speaking, take the following forms:

1. Expropriation of landed property, and the use of landrents to defray State expenditure.
2. A vigorously graduated income-tax.
3. Abolition of the right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigres and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of transport in the hands of the State.
7. Increase of national factories and means of production, cultivation of uncultivated land, and improvement of cultivated land in accordance with a general plan.
8. Universal and equal obligation to work; organisation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Agriculture and urban industry to work hand-in-hand, in such a way as, by degrees, to obliterate the distinction between town and country.
10. Public and free education of all children. Abolition of factory work for children in its present form. Education and material production to be combined.⁴⁶

When, in the course of social evolution, class distinctions have disappeared, and when all the work of production has been concentrated into the hands of associated producers, public authority will lose its political character. Strictly speaking, political power is the organised use of force by one class in order to keep another class in subjection. When the proletariat, in the course of its fight against the bourgeoisie, necessarily consolidates itself into a class, by means of a revolution makes itself the ruling class, and as such forcibly sweeps away the old system of production—it therewith sweeps away the system upon which class conflicts depend, makes an end of classes, and thus abolishes its own rule as a class.

The old bourgeois society, with its classes and class conflicts, will be replaced by an association in which the free development of each will lead to the free development of all.⁴⁷

III

SOCIALIST AND COMMUNIST LITERATURE

I. REACTIONARY SOCIALISM

(a) *Feudalistic Socialism*

By their historical situation, the aristocrats of France and England were called upon to write pamphlets against modern bourgeois society. The former in the July revolution of 1830, and the latter in the movement for parliamentary reform, had once more been defeated by the hated upstart. A serious political struggle was thenceforward out of the question, and the only remaining possibility was a paper warfare.⁴⁸ But even in the domain of literature, the old cries of the Restoration period were outworn. To arouse sympathy, the aristocracy was forced to assume the mask of disinterestedness, and to formulate its indictment against the bourgeoisie in terms which speciously implied the championship of working-class interests. The aristocrats were able to relieve their feelings by penning lampoons against their new masters and by uttering sinister prophecies of impending doom.

Such was the origin of feudalistic socialism; half jeremiad, half pasquinade; half an echo from the past, half a boding of the future; sometimes striking home to the heart of the bourgeoisie with its mordant, witty, and devastating criticism; always ludicrous in its incapacity to understand the march of modern history.

As proletarian insignia, these worthies brandished the mendicant's wallet, in the hope of rallying the people to their cause. But whenever any came to follow them, these recruits descried the ancient feudalistic blazon which adorned the backs of the would-be leaders, and incontinently dispersed with loud and irreverent laughter.

Some of the French legitimists and the members of the Young England group played this farce to perfection.

When the feudalists point out that the feudal method of exploitation was entirely different from bourgeois exploitation, the only thing they forget is that feudal exploitation was carried on in utterly different circumstances and under conditions that are now obsolete. When they show that in feudal days the modern proletariat did not exist, they ignore the fact that the modern bourgeoisie has been an inevitable outcome of feudal society.

Moreover, they make very little attempt to hide the reactionary trend of their criticism. Their chief grievance against the bourgeoisie is that the bourgeois system generates a class which will destroy the old social order.

They blame the bourgeoisie, not so much for having created a proletariat, as for having created a *revolutionary* proletariat.

In practical politics, therefore, they join in all coercive measures used against the workers. In ordinary life, despite their high-flown phrases, they stoop to pick up the golden apples; and they are always ready to trade off loyalty, love, and honour, for wool, beetroot sugar, and distilled liquors.⁴⁹

Of old, priest and feudal magnate were sworn brothers; to-day, in like manner, Christian socialism marches hand-in-hand with feudalistic socialism.

What can be easier than to give Christian asceticism a socialist gloss? Has not Christianity also fulminated against private property, against marriage, and against the State? Have not charity and mendicancy, celibacy and the mortification of the flesh, monasticism and the Church, been severally extolled in place of these? Christian socialism is nothing but the Holy Water wherewith the priest sanctifies the aristocrat's discontent.⁵⁰

(b) *Petty-Bourgeois Socialism*

The feudal aristocracy is not the only class overthrown by the bourgeoisie; it is not the only class whose conditions of existence have atrophied and perished in modern society. The burghers of the medieval towns and the yeomen of the medieval countryside were the forerunners of the modern bourgeoisie. In lands where industry and commerce are backward, this class still vegetates side by side with the evolving bourgeoisie.

In the countries where modern civilisation flourishes, a new petty bourgeoisie has come into being. This class hovers between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and is perpetually being reconstituted as a supplementary component of bourgeois society. Thanks to the working of competition, the members of this intermediate stratum are ever and anon precipitated into the ranks of the proletariat. Indeed, with the evolution of large-scale industry, the day approaches when the petty bourgeoisie will cease to exist as an independent section of modern

society. Alike in commerce and industry and agriculture, its members will be replaced by overseers and underlings.

In such countries as France, where the peasantry comprises a good deal more than half the population, writers who espoused the cause of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie were naturally inclined to put a petty-bourgeois and petty-peasant gloss upon their criticisms of the bourgeoisie, and to contemplate the workers' party from a petty-bourgeois outlook. That was the origin of petty-bourgeois socialism. Sismondi is the head of this school, in England as well as in France.

We owe to this form of socialism a shrewd analysis of the contradictions inherent in modern methods of production. Petty-bourgeois socialism stripped the veil from the hypocritical apologies of the political economists. It gave an irrefutable demonstration of the disastrous effects of machinery and the division of labour. It disclosed the concentration of capital and landed property; over-production; crises; the inevitable ruin of the petty-bourgeoisie and the yeoman class; the wretchedness of the proletariat; the anarchy of production; the flagrant inequalities in the distribution of wealth; the industrial wars the nations wage for mutual extermination; the break-up of the old manners and customs, the old family ties, and the old nationalities.

But in its practical application this petty-bourgeois socialism strives towards two goals: either to bring about the re-establishment of the old methods of production and trade, and therewith the old property relations and the old order of society; or else to cramp the modern means of production and trade within the framework of the old property relations—a framework which the new methods have perforce burst asunder by their expansion. In either case, petty-bourgeois socialism is both reactionary and utopian.

The medieval guild system in manufacturing industry, and patriarchalism in agriculture; these are its last words.

In the end, petty-bourgeois socialism has succumbed to a fit of the blues.⁵¹

(c) *German or "True" Socialism*

The socialist and communist literature of France, which originated under the tyrannical dominance of a bourgeois regime, is the literary expression of the struggle against this regime. It was introduced into Germany at a time when the bourgeoisie in that country was just beginning the fight against feudal absolutism.

German philosophers (would-be philosophers) and men of letters greedily absorbed this literature. The only thing they overlooked was that French social conditions had not been imported into Germany side by side with French socialist literature. Confronted with German social conditions, French socialist literature had no importance in the world of practice. Its bearing was literary, and nothing more. It necessarily assumed the aspect of idle speculation concerning "the social embodiment of man's true nature." In like manner, for German philosophers at the close of the eighteenth century, the demands put forward in the first French revolution were merely the general demands of "practical reason"; and it seemed to them that the manifestations of the will of the French bourgeois revolutionists were but the laws of the pure will, of will as it must be, of the genuine human will.

The sole contribution of German authors was that they harmonised the new French ideas with their own philosophical consciences; or, rather, that they appropriated French ideas while retaining their own philosophical outlook.

They appropriated these ideas just as a foreign tongue is usually assimilated—by translation.

We know how the monks dealt with the manuscripts of the pagan authors of classical antiquity, writing over them absurd legends about the Catholic saints. German men of letters went the opposite way to work with the profane literature of France. They wrote their philosophical nonsense underneath the French original. For example, underneath the French critique of money and its functions, they wrote, "alienation of the essence of mankind"; and underneath the French critique of the bourgeois State they wrote, "overthrow of the supremacy of the abstract universal"; and so on.

They christened this interpolation of their philosophical phraseology into the French argumentation, "philosophy of action," or "true socialism," or "German science of socialism," or "philosophical basis of socialism," or what not.

In this way, French socialist and communist literature was completely emasculated. In German hands, it ceased to be the expression of the class struggle. Consequently the Germans plumed themselves upon having transcended "French narrowness." They congratulated themselves because, instead of defending true needs, they had defended the "need for truth"; because, instead of championing the interests of the proletariat, they had championed the interests of the essence of

mankind, of that archetypal man who belongs to no class—and is therefore outside the domain of reality, and to be found only in the realm of philosophical fantasy!

This German socialism, which took its clumsy schoolboy exercises so seriously and trumpeted them in the market-place as a cheapjack cries his wares, gradually lost the innocence of its pristine pedantry.

The struggle of the German bourgeoisie, and especially of the Prussian bourgeoisie, against the feudalists and the absolute monarchy—in other words, the liberal movement—now became something to be reckoned with.

Thus the “true” socialists were given the chance they had longed for; the chance of confronting the political movement with socialist demands; the chance of fulminating the traditional anathemas against liberalism, against representative government, against bourgeois competition, bourgeois freedom of the press, bourgeois law, bourgeois liberty and equality; the chance of haranguing the masses and telling them they had nothing to gain, everything to lose, from this bourgeois movement. German socialists found it convenient to forget that French criticism (whose futile echo German socialism was) presupposed the existence of modern bourgeois society, with the concrete conditions of existence corresponding thereto, and with the appropriate political constitution—the very things which had still to be fought for in Germany.

The German absolutist governments, with their train of parsons, pedagogues, country squires, and bureaucrats, found that “true” socialism was a welcome scare-crow to check the threatening advance of the bourgeoisie.

It also served as a sugary counterpart to the floggings and shootings with which these same governments had greeted the risings of the German workers.

Whilst in this way “true” socialism was a weapon useful to the governments in their fight against the German bourgeoisie, it also represented a directly reactionary interest, that of the German petty bourgeoisie. In Germany this class, dating from the sixteenth century and continually reappearing in new forms, constitutes the real social foundation of the existing order.

The preservation of the petty bourgeoisie implies the maintenance of the existing order in Germany. The industrial and political supre-

macy of the bourgeoisie threatens the petty bourgeoisie with destruction; on the one hand owing to the concentration of capital, and on the other hand owing to the rise of a revolutionary proletariat. "True" socialism promised to kill both birds with one stone. The new doctrine spread like an epidemic.

The robe woven out of speculative cobwebs, broidered with flowers of rhetoric, steeped in a dew of sickly sentiment—this transcendental vesture in which the German socialists draped their meagre skeleton of "eternal verities"—was well designed to encourage the sale of the wares in the appropriate market.

German socialism, for its part, came more and more to find its mission as the grandiloquent champion of the petty bourgeoisie.

German socialists extolled Germany as the model among nations, and the German petty bourgeois as the model among men. To all the meannesses of this exemplar they ascribed an esoteric, a higher, a socialist significance, so that each of them denoted its opposite. They went to the extreme of making a direct attack on communism for its "crudely destructive" trend, and of proclaiming their own unbiassed superiority to the class struggle. With trifling exceptions, all the so-called socialist and communist publications now circulating in Germany belong to the domain of this foul and enervating literature.⁵²

2. CONSERVATIVE OR BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM

There are certain bourgeois who want to redress social grievances—in order to safeguard bourgeois society.

To this category belong: economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, welfare workers, charity organisers, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind. Such bourgeois socialism has been elaborated into vast systems.

Proudhon's *Philosophy of Poverty* is an instance.⁵³

Bourgeois socialists want the conditions of life that characterise modern society without the struggles and the dangers which are the inevitable outcome of these conditions. They want extant society without its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They want the bourgeoisie without the proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally regards the world in which it rules as the best of all possible worlds. Bourgeois socialism elaborates this comforting notion into a partial or

complete system. When it summons the workers to realise their plans and to enter the New Jerusalem, it is really doing no more than asking them to stay in society as it now is, but to rid themselves of their animosity towards that society.

A second form of conservative or bourgeois socialism, less systematic than the former but more practical, is one whose adherents try to disgust the workers with every kind of revolutionary movement by proving that no political transformation can be of any use to the working class, that only a change in the material conditions of life, a change in economic conditions, can advantage the workers. When, however, socialists of this kidney speak of changing the material conditions of life, they have no thought of doing away with capitalist methods of production—for that can only be effected by revolution. They mean nothing more than administrative reforms within the framework of the extant methods of production, changes which would leave the existing relations between capital and wage-labour unaltered, and would (at best) help the bourgeoisie by lessening the cost and simplifying the technique of bourgeois rule.

Bourgeois socialism finds its most fitting expression in empty rhetorical flourishes.

Free trade, for the benefit of the working class; protection, for the benefit of the working class; prison reform, for the benefit of the working class—these are the last words of bourgeois socialism, and the only ones that are seriously meant.

The essence of bourgeois socialism is the contention that the bourgeois are bourgeois for the benefit of the working class!⁵⁴

3. CRITICAL-UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

We are not concerned here with the literature which, in all great modern revolutions, has voiced the demands of the proletariat (the writing of Babeuf, etc.)⁵⁵

The first direct efforts made by the proletariat—in a time of general ferment, in a period when feudal society was being overthrown—to further its own interests as a class were necessarily futile, owing to the undeveloped condition of the proletariat itself, and owing to the non-existence of the material conditions requisite for the liberation of the workers (conditions which are only engendered during the bourgeois epoch). The revolutionary literature thrown up in connection

with these early proletarian movements was perforce reactionary. It preached universal asceticism and a crude equalitarianism.

Socialist and communist system properly so called, those of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, etc., originated during the first, comparatively undeveloped phase of the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. (See above, under "Bourgeois and Proletarians.")⁵⁶

True, the inventors of these systems were aware of the existence of class conflicts and of disintegrating forces within the prevailing social system. But they could not discern in the proletariat either historical initiative or independent political movement.

Since, however, the development of class antagonisms goes hand-in-hand with the development of industry, these writers had no chance (in their day) of finding ready-made the material conditions requisite for the liberation of the proletariat. They therefore tried to discover a social science, social laws, that would create these conditions.

In their case, individual inventiveness had to take the place of social activity, imagined conditions of liberation must serve their turn instead of historically extant ones, a social organisation evolved out of the thinker's inner consciousness was the only available substitute for the gradually developing organisation of the proletariat to form a class. To them, the history of days to come presented itself as nothing more than propaganda and the practical realisation of their social fantasies.

Their firm conviction was, indeed, that in their schemes they were mainly representing the interests of the working class as the class that suffered most. The proletariat only existed for them in the aspect of the class that suffered most.

Owing to the undeveloped conditions of the class struggle in their day, and owing to their own social position, they fancied themselves uplifted to a position sublimely above the class struggle. They wanted to improve the conditions of life for all members of society, even for those who were best off. They therefore continually appealed to society at large without distinction of class; or even, by preference, to the ruling class. Every one who understood their system would (so they thought) at once recognise it to be the best conceivable plan for establishing the best conceivable society.

They therefore renounced political activity, and, above all, revolutionary activity. They wanted to attain their end by peaceful means;

they tried, by the force of example and by little experiments (foredoomed to failure), to prepare the way for the new social gospel.

Such fancy pictures of the society of days to come are painted at a time when the proletariat is still in a very primitive phase of development and therefore still takes a somewhat fanciful view of its own position. They give expression to the workers' first instinctive aspirations towards a thoroughgoing transformation of society.

But these socialist and communist writings also contain critical elements. They attack all the foundations of extant society, and they therefore supply much matter which has been of great value in promoting the enlightenment of the workers. Their positive statements regarding the future society (for instance: the obliteration of the contrast between town and country; abolition of the family, private gain, and wage-labour; the proclamation of social harmony; the transformation of the State into a mere instrument for the superintendence of production)—these several statements give expression to different aspects of the disappearance of the class antagonisms which were then merely beginning to develop, and which the utopists could as yet only discern in vague outline. That is why even these statements still have a quite utopian ring.

The importance of critical-utopian socialism and communism is inversely proportional to their historical antiquity. As the modern class struggle develops and takes shape, the pose of being above the battle, the fantastic attitude of hostility to class-war tactics, ceases to have either practical value or theoretical justification. The originators of these utopian systems were in many respects revolutionary; but their disciples are reactionary sectarians, who cling to the obsolete formulas of the utopian pioneers and ignore the progressive historical evolution of the proletariat. Logically enough, therefore, they try to damp down the class struggle and to mediate between the two opposing classes. They continue to dream of the experimental realisation of their social utopias—the establishment of isolated phalansteries; the founding of home colonies; the setting up of little Icarias—pocket editions of the New Jerusalem. For aid in the building of all these castles in the air, they are forced to appeal to the philanthropy of bourgeois hearts and bourgeois money-bags. By degrees they join the category of the above-described reactionary or conservative socialists, from whom they are distinguished only by their more systematic pedantry and by the fanatical intensity of their superstitious belief in the miraculous efficacy of their social panacea.

That is why they are so fiercely opposed to political action on the part of the workers, for they think it cannot but be the expression of a blind lack of faith in their new gospel.⁵⁷

The Owenites in England oppose the Chartists, just as the Fourierists in France oppose those who give utterance to their views in the newspaper "La Reforme."⁵⁸

IV ATTITUDE OF COMMUNISTS TOWARDS THE VARIOUS OPPOSITION PARTIES

SECTION TWO will have made evident the relationship between the communists and extant working-class parties, such as the Chartists in England and the Agrarian Reformers in the United States.⁵⁹

Communists fight on behalf of the immediate aims and interests of the working class, but in the present movement they are also defending the future of that movement.

In France, the communists join forces with the social democrats against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, while reserving the right to maintain a critical attitude towards the phrasemaking and illusion that are part of the revolutionary heritage.

In Switzerland, they support the radicals, without forgetting that this party is made up of conflicting elements, for some of its members are democratic socialists in the French meaning of the term, whereas others are radical bourgeois.⁶⁰

Among the Poles, the communists support the party which considers an agrarian revolution essential to national liberation—the party which initiated the Cracow insurrection in 1846.⁶¹

In Germany, as soon as the bourgeoisie shows itself revolutionary, the Communist Party joins hands with it against the absolutist monarchy, the feudalist squirearchy and the petty bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party never misses a chance of impressing upon the minds of the workers that there is an essential antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The aim is to show the German workers how the social and political conditions which the bourgeoisie perforce establishes when it rises to power, can be used as weapons against it, so that the fight against it in Germany shall begin the very instant the reactionary classes have been overthrown.

Communists pay special attention to Germany. There are two reasons for this. First of all, Germany is upon the eve of a bourgeois revolution. Secondly, this revolution will take place under comparatively advanced conditions as far as the general civilisation of Europe is concerned, and when the German proletariat is much more highly developed than was the English proletariat in the seventeenth century or the French proletariat in the eighteenth. Consequently, in nineteenth-century Germany, the bourgeois revolution can only be the immediate precursor of a proletarian revolution.⁶²

In short, communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against extant social and political conditions.

In all these movements, communists bring the property question to the fore, regarding it as fundamental, no matter in what phase of development it may happen to be.

Finally, communists work everywhere to promote mutual understanding among the democratic parties of all lands, and to bring about their unification.⁶³

Communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purposes can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order. Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

PROLETARIANS OF ALL LANDS, UNITE!

PART TWO

Explanatory Notes

I.

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS

1. THE HARRYING OF THE COMMUNISTS IN 1847.

PIUS IX, at the date of his election to the papal chair in 1846, looked upon himself as a "liberal." Yet in his attitude towards socialism he proved to be no less hostile than the tsar, Nicholas I (1796-1855), and played the part of policeman of Europe even before the outbreak of revolution in 1848. Metternich (1773-1859) chancellor of the Austrian empire and acknowledged leader of the European reaction, was at this time in specially close relationship with Guizot, the outstanding historian of his day, who had directed French foreign affairs since 1840, and subsequently became head of the ministry. Guizot (1787-1874) was the intellectual protagonist of high finance and of the industrial bourgeoisie; he was the irreconcilable foe of the proletariat. At the behest of the Prussian government, Guizot expelled Marx (1818-1883) from Paris. The German police not only gave the communists no peace in Germany, they likewise harassed them abroad, in France, in Belgium, and even in Switzerland, using all their available powers, and making use of every means to hinder communist propaganda and drive it underground. The French radicals, Marrast (1802-1852), Carnot (1801-1888), and Marie (1795-1870), waged polemic warfare, not only against the socialists and communists, but likewise against the social democrats of the day, headed by Ledru-Rollin (1807-1874), and Flocon (1800-1866).

2. HAXTHAUSEN, MAURER, AND MORGAN

IN later editions of the Communist Manifesto, to the words "the history of all human society," etc., Engels (1820-1895) added the following note: "That is, all written history. In 1847, the primitive history of society, the social organisation that existed before the writing of history had begun, was practically unknown. Subsequently Haxthausen discovered the communal ownership of land in Russia,

Maurer proved that such communal ownership was the social foundation for the history of all the Teutonic races, and by degrees it became plain that village communities in which the land was communally owned were the primitive form of society all the way from India to Ireland. At length, the internal organisation of this primitive communist society was disclosed, in its typical form, by Morgan's crowning discovery of the true nature of the gens and its relationship to the tribe. With the break-up of these primeval communities begins the splitting of society into separate classes, which in due time became antagonistic classes."

August von Haxthausen (1792-1866), was a Prussian baron. In 1843, at the request of Nicholas I, he went to Russia to investigate and report upon the land laws, the agricultural conditions, and the life of the peasants. The fruits of his labours were contained in a work entitled [A Study of the Folk Life and, more especially, the Agrarian Institutions of Russia], the first volume of which appeared in 1847, and the third in 1852, nearly five years after the publication of the Communist Manifesto. This third volume was mainly devoted to an account of Russian agrarian communism. In his Russian journeyings Haxthausen was accompanied by Alexander Herzen (1812-1870), whose revolutionary political writings were later to bring him so greatly into prominence. Influenced by his friend, Haxthausen emphasised the importance of Russian agrarian communism, and saw in it the means of saving Russia from the "plague" of having to go through a period of proletarian development.

Georg Ludwig von Maurer (1790-1872), was a great German historian, lawyer, statesman, and author of many important works on the early institutions of the Germans. These volumes were published in the course of the eighteen fifties and sixties, and dealt exhaustively with the history of village and urban communal institutions in Germany. In contrast with the old outlook (vestiges of which are to be found in the Communist Manifesto), Maurer proved that the township in the early Middle Ages, far from arising out of medieval serfdom, developed from the free rural commune (the mediaval *mark*).

Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881), the American, was an ethnologist and a student of primitive social organisation. He lived among the Iroquois Indians, leading their life, and studying their manners and customs. Morgan held that the fundamental factors in historical development consisted in discoveries and inven-

tions in the field of technique, in the development of the material conditions of existence. His ideas concerning the development of the human family, and in special his theories of the systems of consanguinity and affinity, were taken up by Engels and discussed by him in his *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, first published in 1884. In this book, Engels endeavoured to trace the course of the development of society since the dawn of history, and to show its gradual transformation into a class society.

3 THE DECLINE OF THE MEDIEVAL ECONOMY, THE AGE OF GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERY, AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE WORLD MARKET.

ALREADY during the second half of the fifteenth century, medieval society, based on small-scale production, was in active process of decay. The rise of a monetary economy, as a result of the rapid growth of the means of exchange both at home and abroad, created favourable conditions for the development of monetary and mercantile capital. In the rural areas, the feudal dues, instead of being paid in kind, were more and more coming to be paid in money; the conditions of free and of serf small-scale production were worsening apace; feudal landowners were changing into farmers, and were using every means to obtain wealth in the form of money. The enormous retinues and courts of the feudal seigneurs were dismissed, and these masterless men, together with the expropriated peasants, who had been deprived of the lands they and their forbears had tilled for countless generations, swelled the ranks of the "sturdy rogues and vagabonds" who encumbered the highways and filled the towns. The independent craft guilds, rent by dissensions between masters and subordinates, fell under the sway of merchant capital.

A number of technical improvements in the realms of metallurgical production, textile manufacture, navigation, armaments, clock-making, astronomical instruments; the invention of printing; the progress of scientific research, in especial the new discoveries in the astronomical world—all these gave a mighty impetus to the growth of productive forces, and encouraged persons of an enterprising disposition to assume the initiative. Competition between the merchants and manufacturers conducting their business in the western portions of the Mediterranean Sea or upon the shores of the Atlantic (in such ports as Genoa and Lisbon), and the Venetians who had the monopoly of the Asiatic trade

and were lords of the eastern Mediterranean, impelled the Portuguese, Genoese, and Spanish merchant adventurers to seek a new road to the Indies. Prince Henry the Navigator (1394-1460), fourth son of King Joao of Portugal and the English princess Philippa, daughter of John of Gaunt, had already in the early half of the fifteenth century distinguished himself by the services he rendered to geographical discovery. He sent ships to places on the coast of Africa hitherto unknown, and in 1418 and 1420 his captains rediscovered Porto Santo and Madeira. He was responsible for the dispatching of an expedition to explore the Azores, whose colonisation by the Portuguese progressed steadily. By 1460 Prince Henry's ships had pushed on to places nearer the equator, to a point a hundred leagues or so beyond Cape Verde. Then, in 1486, Bartholomew Diaz (1455-1500) rounded the Cape of Good Hope. Before the Portuguese could organise a further expedition for the discovery of the new route to the Indies, the Genoese navigator, Christopher Columbus (1446-1506), set out westward on the quest, and in 1492 discovered the West Indian islands. John Cabot (1450-1498) and his son Sebastian Cabot (1474-1557) landed on the shores of North America in 1497. But it was not until a year later that Vasco da Gama (1460-1524) completed the work begun by Diaz, and discovered the ocean road to India. Two years later the Florentine shipman Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512), made his way to the shores of Brazil, and it is after him that the Americas have been named. In 1500, the Portuguese commander, Pedro Alvares Cabral (died 1526), appointed by his king to follow the course of Da Gama, was driven by adverse winds so far from his track that he reached the Brazilian coast on Good Friday of that year. At last, in 1520, Ferdinand Magellan (1470-1521), the first circumnavigator of the globe, made his way into the Pacific through the straits which still bear his name.

Thanks to these voyages and discoveries the world market was greatly extended to absorb the growing production of the sixteenth century, the century which saw the birth of the contemporary capitalistic era.

Not until the second half of the sixteenth century did the ruthless plundering and extermination of the native populations of the newly discovered lands by the early conquistadors—Cortes (1485-1547) in Mexico, Pizarro (1476-1541) in Peru, for instance—yield place to the systematic exploitation of the virgin lands with the help of slave labour. In the course of a few centuries, Africa became the hunting ground of whites in search of negro slaves for the American market.

From 1508 to 1860, no fewer than fifteen million negroes were shipped across the Atlantic, and no less a number died on the voyage, victims of "philanthropic" Portuguese, Spanish, French, and, above all, British slave dealers. "It was upon the foundation of the slave trade that Liverpool became a great city, for there the slave trade was the method of primary accumulation. Almost down to our own day, there have been 'respectable' citizens of Liverpool ready to write enthusiastically about the slave trade. See, for instance, Dr. Aikin's already quoted work, written in 1795, where he speaks of 'that spirit of bold adventure which has characterised the trade of Liverpool, and rapidly carried it to its present state of prosperity; has occasioned vast employment for shipping and sailors, and greatly augmented the demand for the manufacturers of the country.'" (Marx, *Capital*, I, 842.) At the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the development of the cotton industry in England gave an added impetus to the production of raw cotton in the southern States of North America, slavery had become a national institution across the Atlantic, and the breeding of slaves a commercial undertaking.

The discovery and exploitation of gold and silver mines, from 1545 onwards in Bolivia, and from 1548 in Mexico, contributed to the enormous reserves of gold and silver in European hands. The production of silver from 1501 to 1544 amounted to something like 460 million marks [the "mark" is half an English pound avoirdupois]; from 1546 to 1600 production had increased to 2880 millions. The amount of silver coin which was put into circulation showed a proportional increase.

The systematic colonisation of North America by the British was begun in 1620. The French followed suit. At the outset, Portugal took charge of affairs in the East Indies. But in 1600 the Dutch and the British almost simultaneously inaugurated a special campaign whereby, little by little, struggling with their European rivals (the Portuguese, and, later, the French), they acquired possession of the East Indies. The first Europeans to enter into relations with China, were the Portuguese, who took possession of Macao in 1557. The British did not establish themselves on the China coast until 1684.

4. MANUFACTURE.

WE are concerned here with manufacture as a phase in the development of industrial capitalism. Historically speaking, manufacture developed as a set-off against independent craftsmanship.

When the merchant capitalist sweeps the independent artisan into his net, he, as merchant-entrepreneur, brings under one roof a considerable number of independent craftsmen who work at the completion of this, that, or the other phase of a task (as do tailors, for instance), or at the fashioning of separate parts of a commodity, parts which are then assembled to make up a single product (such as a cart). The advantage of such manufacture in the early days of its introduction consists in this, that production assumes considerable dimensions and curtails unnecessary expense. On this foundation, a system is built up, necessitating more and more specialised labour, until manufacture is transformed into a unified mechanism, the individual sections of which are superintended by workers each of whom makes no more than a minute part of the article which his predecessor was wont to make as a whole, and who thus becomes as it were a tool in the process. In England, in Holland, and, later, in France, the manufacturing period of capitalist production began during the second half of the sixteenth century and reached its climax in the early decades of the eighteenth century. [Be careful to remark that the authors of the Manifesto use the term "manufacture" in the restricted sense above defined, and not in the extended sense that includes "machinofacture," described in the next note.]

5. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF MACHINOFACURE.

THE industrial revolution, the result of which was the replacement of capitalistic manufacture by large-scale production, was brought about by the invention of new machinery towards the end of the eighteenth century. England led the way, and broadly speaking we may say that this revolution did not end before the first half of the nineteenth century. It began with a number of discoveries and inventions, above all in the realms of cattle-breeding, agriculture, mining, textile production, and transport. The initial impetus was given by the elaboration of what is called the working machine; by the replacement of the craftsman's tools, or of manufacturing labour, by such working machines. In 1733, John Kay (flourished 1733-1764) took out a patent for his fly-shuttle, by which arrangement only one hand was needed to throw the shuttle backwards and forwards. The first stage in the evolution of mechanical spinning was effected by the invention of Lewis Paul (died 1759), who obtained a patent in 1738, and who was assisted by John Wyatt (1700-1766). This machine

was described as able "to spin without fingers." (Cf. *Capital*, I, 392.). In 1766, James Hargreaves (died 1778), a weaver and carpenter, invented the spinning-jenny used in the manufacture of cotton. In 1767, Richard Arkwright (1732-1792) invented his celebrated spinningframe, of which the chief value was the provision of the warp which was lacking in Hargreaves' invention. Samuel Crompton (1753-1827), a hardworking farmer and weaver, devoted five years to the invention of his spinning-mule, a machine which took precedence of those invented by Hargreaves and Arkwright in the spinning of the finest yarn ever made. The first power-loom was invented by Edmund Cartwright (1743-1823) as early as 1785, but it was not until some years later that the invention was popularised by the cotton-mill owner, John Horrocks (1768-1804). By the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century, the powerloom had replaced the old-fashioned hand-loom in the textile industry.

The growth of the mining industry during the course of the eighteenth century (the production of coal had increased from 214,800 tons in 1700, to 7,205,400 tons in 1770), called for the universal introduction of pumping machines. It was in getting water out of the mines that steam power was first turned to practical account. Watt's first engine merely served to universalise the use of steam-driven pumps which had been introduced by Newcomen (1663-1729). Watt's new pump had a double-acting engine, and was further improved by a patent which he took out in 1784. Now the motive force which had hitherto been used almost exclusively in the mining industry could be advantageously applied to drive the spinning-mills and the power-looms, steam replacing water as a source of energy. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century the use of steam power in the textile industry became almost universal. Next came the development of steam transport. In 1807, Robert Fulton (1765-1815) perfected the discovery of steam navigation; and George Stephenson (1781-1848) designed a locomotive which was successfully tried in 1814. Five years later he laid down the first experimental railway. The first steamboat travelled from America to Europe in 1819, and took 26 days to complete the voyage. The first railway was opened to the public in England in the year 1825. In 1830, British railroads covered about 57 miles; in 1840 they covered 843 miles; and in 1850 had attained 6630 miles.

In the realm of agriculture, the old three-field system was

replaced by the modern method of rotation of crops. Robert Bakewell (1725-1795), by his achievements in the breeding of live-stock, transformed this, as it were, into a branch of factory industry, showing a marvellous skill in producing different types of beasts to meet the varying needs of the market. His specialities were long-wool Leicester sheep, and the Dishley long-horn cattle, which became famous. The old rural relations were now more and more subordinated to the conditions of capitalist production. Side by side with the landed gentry and landless peasants who had become agricultural labourers, there appeared a new type of large-scale farmer, substantially an industrial capitalist, exploiting wage labour on the land, thereby making profit for himself and rent for the landlord. The capitalist trend of agriculture was still more marked in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

6. POLITICAL EVOLUTION OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

WHAT the authors have in mind is, first and foremost, the political evolution of the French bourgeoisie. Elsewhere Marx writes: "The history of the bourgeoisie may be divided into two phases: during the first phase the bourgeoisie became differentiated as a class under the dominion of the feudal order and the absolute monarchy; during the second phase when it had already organised itself as a class, it overthrew the feudalist social order and the monarchy, and set up a bourgeois system in place of the old. The first phase covered a longer period of time than the second, and needed a greater expenditure of energy for its achievement." [Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, (Pub. by Burmon Publishing House) P. 136-37.]

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the French communes were engaged in a struggle with the feudal magnates, and took advantage of the quarrels among the feudalists. ("The name of "commune," as Engels tells us in a note to later editions of the Manifesto, was adopted by the town communities in Italy and France when they had bought or wrested from the feudal lords the right of self-government.) In the early years of the fourteenth century they applied for representation in the States General, the assembly in which the whole nation was supposed to be represented. From 1356 to 1358, the Parisian bourgeoisie, headed by Etienne Marcel (died 1358), the provost of the merchants of Paris, endeavoured to change the States General into a truly representative institution, which should meet at fixed periods without the necessity of waiting for the king's summons. The absolute

monarch, profiting by the dissensions between the various orders (clergy, nobility, etc.), came to terms with the bourgeois opposition. The bourgeoisie became the "tiers etat" [third estate], a taxable order, a recognised part of the centralised monarchical State, concentrating all its energies on using the governmental apparatus in the interests of commercial and industrial development. At the head of this movement we find bourgeois financiers who, together with some of the court nobles who had turned to this rising power for support, tried to use the monarchical power as a tool to serve their own purposes. The break-down of this policy, founded as it was upon the merciless exploitation of the toiling masses, and upon the complete neglect of petty-bourgeois interests, led to the great French revolution, which flamed up towards the end of the eighteenth century. Following upon the Napoleonic interlude (which terminated in 1815) and the Bourbon restoration, came the revolution of 1830 and the establishment of the "July monarchy," the classical form of parliamentary government based upon a bourgeois suffrage.

In the Netherlands, the burghers waged incessant warfare against feudal institutions, a warfare which at times assumed the form of a veritable civil war (as, for instance, the revolt of the Flemish towns led by Ypres and Bruges in 1324 and lasting for several years). During the second half of the sixteenth century the Netherlands bourgeoisie, in company with the middle and the lesser nobility, headed the national uprising against the rule of the Habsburgs, and, after a long and bitter struggle, the Lowlands achieved their independence from foreign rule. The Netherlands were the first to become a bourgeois State, and from the seventeenth century onward served as model for all the other bourgeois States which in the course of time were established in western Europe.

The independent urban republics of Italy, after they had succeeded in throwing off the yoke of the landed aristocracy, gradually assumed the form of commercial and industrial oligarchies. But, concomitantly with the decay of the commercial predominance of northern Italy (where merchant capitalism had developed earlier than in any other region of Europe), there occurred a set-back to the development of capitalism in the towns likewise. These merchant cities thus lost their erstwhile importance, and it was not until the nineteenth century that a renewal of the process of political consolidation of the Italian bourgeoisie took place.

In Great Britain, the urban communities secured parliamentary representation at a very early date, though it was not until industrial capitalism began to develop that the British bourgeoisie ceased to be satisfied with playing the part of adviser and suppliant, and became more and more urgent in the fight for political power. The parliamentary war which lasted from 1641 to 1649, ended in the execution of Charles I and the establishment of the Commonwealth under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell. After a short period of Stuart restoration, the revolution broke out anew in 1688, and this time succeeded in establishing a constitutional monarchy. Now the bourgeoisie found worthy allies in the landed gentry, who were rapidly undergoing a process of embourgeoisement. Power in the economic field fell into the hands of the more influential stratum of the bourgeoisie, just as it did at a later date in France. Not until the nineteenth century was well advanced, after the electoral reforms of 1832 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, did the British State become, as it were, a joint-stock company comprising the whole bourgeois class banded together for the exploitation of the world market, and only then did the British government become a committee for the conduct of the affairs of the bourgeoisie.

The process of political centralisation, in countries which had hardly as yet achieved a national unity, may best be studied in the history of such lands as Germany and Italy during the course of the nineteenth century. As far as France was concerned, the process assumed an especially brisk and conspicuous form, and here bourgeois political centralisation was achieved between the years 1789 and 1815, though finishing touches had to be put in 1830, 1848-50, and 1870-75.

7. THE GROWTH OF EXCHANGE AND THE DOMINION OF CASH PAYMENT.

"EXCHANGE has a history of its own, and has gone through various stages of development. At one time, as for instance during the Middle Ages, only superfluities were exchanged, only those things which were produced in excess of people's needs. At another period, not only the excess of production, but the . . . entire product of industry, found its way into the realm of commerce. This was a period when production was completely dependent upon exchange. . . . At length a day dawned when even the things which people had formerly looked upon as inalienable, became objects of exchange and bargaining, in fact could be disposed of. Even those things which

had hitherto been handed over but not exchanged, had been given but not sold, had been acquired but not bought—virtue, love, opinions, science, conscience, etc.—passed into commerce. This period is one of wholesale corruption, of universal venality, or, to write in terms of political economy, it is the period when everything, spiritual and material, has become a saleable commodity, is taken to the market for the appraisalment of its proper value. [Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy* (Pub. by B.P.H. Calcutta), P. 26.]

“When it becomes possible to hold fast to a commodity as exchange-value, or to exchange-value as a commodity, the greed for money awakens. As the circulation of commodities extends, the power of money increases. Of money which is an absolutely social form of wealth, ever ready for use. Columbus, in a letter from Jamaica penned in 1503, says: ‘Gold is a wonderful thing! Whoever owns it is lord of all he wants. With gold it is even possible to open for souls a way into paradise!’ Since money does not disclose what has been transformed into it, everything, whether a commodity or not, is convertible into gold. Everything becomes saleable and purchasable. Circulation is the great social retort into which everything is thrown, and out of which everything is recovered as crystallised money. Not even the bones of the saints are able to withstand this alchemy; and still less able to withstand it are more delicate things; sacrosanct things which are outside the commercial traffic of men. Just as all the quantitative differences between commodities are effaced in money, so money on its side, a radical leveller, effaces all distinctions.” (Marx, *Capital*, German, I, 195, English, I, 112-3.)

The idyllic and patriarchal relationships existing in Britain on the very eve of the industrial revolution in that country, were admirably described by Engels in *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England* [*The Condition of the Working Class in England*, London, 1892]. Here, writing in 1845, he gave a picture of the weavers who still enjoyed possession of their little plots of land:

“It requires no feat of imagination to guess what the moral and intellectual life of this class of workers was like. They were shut off from the towns, whither they never went (for the yarn and the cloth were bought up by itinerant agents who paid the weavers a wage), so entirely divorced from the towns, that even in old age, after living a lifetime in the neighbourhood of a city, they could say that they had never been there. This was the state of affairs up to the

moment when they were robbed of their means of livelihood by the introduction of machinery, and were forced to seek work in the towns. The weavers stood on the same intellectual and moral plane as the yeomen in their locality, people with whom they associated freely and with whom they had ties of the utmost intimacy, thanks to the small holdings they cultivated in the intervals of weaving. They looked upon the squire, the chief landowner in the neighbourhood, as their natural superior. To him they went for advice, laying their petty troubles before him for settlement, and paying him the reverence such a patriarchal relationship involved. They were 'respectable' folk, worthy husbands and fathers; they led moral lives because there was no temptation to be immoral, seeing that there were no taverns or stews in the country districts, and because mine host at whose inn they now and again quenched their thirst was a 'respectable' man like themselves, a tenant farmer maybe, who prided himself on his good ale, his good order, and was always careful to close his house early on holidays and feast days. The children were kept at home, were taught obedience, and brought up in the fear of God. So long as the young ones remained single, these patriarchal relationships held firm. Children grew to manhood or womanhood in idyllic simplicity and close companionship with their playmates until they married. Though, one might almost say as a general rule, there were intimate relationships between the sexes before marriage took place, it was understood between the pair that these were a mere prelude to the wedding ceremony, which followed as a matter of course. In a word, the English artisans and craftsmen of those days lived and had their being in retirement, in a seclusion which may still [1845] be found in certain parts of Germany, without intellectual activity and without violent perturbations in their way of life. Seldom were they able to read; still more rarely could they write. They went regularly to church, never talked politics, never conspired together, never gave time to thought, delighted in bodily revels and games, listened to readings from the Bible with traditional piety, and, in all humility, ordered themselves lowly and reverently to their betters. But from an intellectual point of view they were dead, living solely for their own petty interests, for their looms and their tiny gardens, and recking little of the mighty movement which, beyond their limited horizon, was sweeping through the whole of mankind. They felt at ease in their tranquilly vegetative existence. Had it not been for the industrial revolution, they would never have broken away from a life which was unworthy of human

beings, despite its glamour of romance. In truth, they were not human beings, but merely machines that worked in the service of the small group of nobles who had hitherto been the substance of history." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., pp. 2-4; cf. English translation, pp. 2-4.)

Ready money, the dominant factor in capitalist society, is the chief stimulus in the psychological life of the bourgeoisie. Hence arises the slogan: "Put money in thy purse!" Engels paints a vivid picture of this in the following lines: "The English bourgeois is quite indifferent as to whether his workers die of hunger or not, so long as while life lasts they earn him plenty of money. Everything is measured in terms of money, and everything which does not bring in money is looked upon as foolish, unpractical, and ideological nonsense. . . . The worker is, for him, not a human being, but merely 'a hand,' and it is thus that the bourgeois always speaks of him, even in the worker's hearing. The bourgeois recognises that, as Carlyle puts it, 'cash payment is the only nexus between man and man.' Even the bonds which link man and wife together may, in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, be expressed in terms of ready money. The pitiful condition of slavery which money imposes on the bourgeoisie has left its traces in the English language. If you wish to say that an individual possesses £10,000, you express the matter thus: 'So and so is worth £10,000.' He who has money is considered 'respectable' and is esteemed accordingly; he takes his place among 'the better sort of people,' and wields much influence; everything he does sets a standard for his associates. The huskstering spirit permeates the whole language. Every relationship is expressed by words borrowed from the commercial vocabulary, and is summed up in economic categories. Supply and demand—this formula represents the whole of an Englishman's outlook on life. Hence there must be free competition in every field of human activity, hence the regime of laissez-faire and laissez-aller in government, medicine, and education; soon this policy of non-interference will spread into the realm of religion, for the unchallenged dominion of the State church is breaking down more and more rapidly as the days go by." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., pp. 279-280; cf. English translation, p. 277.)

8. REVOLUTIONARY CHARACTER OF CAPITALISM.

"As long as handicraftsmanship and manufacture form the general foundation of social production, the allotting of the producer

to one branch of production exclusively, the breaking-up of the primary multifariousness of his occupation, is a necessary step in evolution. On this foundation, and as the fruit of experience, each particular branch of production assumes the appropriate technical form; gradually perfects it; and, when a certain degree of maturity has been attained, becomes quickly crystallised in that form. What induces change here and there is, in addition to the supply of new kinds of raw material by commerce, a gradual change in the instrument of labour. Once the form which experience shows to be most suitable has been acquired, it becomes petrified, as it were, this being shown by the way in which it is often handed down from one generation to another for thousands of years. . . . Modern industry never regards or treats the extant form of a productive process as definite. Its technical basis is, therefore, revolutionary; whereas the technical basis of all earlier methods of production was essentially conservative. Through the instrumentality of machinery, chemical processes, and other methods, modern industry, changing the technical basis of production, changes therewith the functions of the workers and the social combinations of the labour process. At the same time, no less continuously, it transforms the division of labour within society, incessantly shifting masses of capital and masses of labour from one branch of production to another." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 524-526.) Concerning the question of the historical role of capitalism, see Plekhanov (1856-1918) [Our Differences], Works, Russian edition, Vol. I, pp. 230-237.

9. THE SPREAD OF CAPITALISM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

DURING the sixteenth century, the impetus to the development of capitalism was provided by the extension of the market throughout the world. But it is only since the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century that the bourgeoisie has come to occupy the whole surface of the earth, making use of missionaries and men of science in order to penetrate into the most distant corners of the globe. Between 1770 and 1848, the British acquired Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the whole of Hindustan. France, having lost most of her colonial possessions to England during the Napoleonic wars, compensated herself for her losses by annexing large areas in North Africa. And so on.

10. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE GROWTH OF THE WORLD MARKET.

"IN the days before the invention of machinery, the industrial activity of each land mainly consisted in the working up of raw materials grown in the native soil. Thus Great Britain produced cloth from the wool of home-bred sheep; Germany worked up flax into linen; France produced silk and flax and transformed these into the finished article; the East Indies and the Levant grew cotton and converted it into cotton goods; and so on. The introduction of steam-driven machinery brought about so great an extension of the division of labour, that large-scale industry, uprooted from the native soil, came to depend solely upon the world market, international exchanges, and the international division of labour." [Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, P. 110.]

Had it not been for cotton, jute, petroleum, and rubber, European industry would have been doomed to destruction. The Italian engineering and automobile industry is entirely dependent upon the import of coal and metal. All the wares conveyed over the St. Gothard pass in one year during the most flourishing epoch of medieval commerce, could now be comfortably packed into a couple of ordinary goods trains. The extent to which international trade has developed is illustrated by the following figures. In 1800, the international turnover of goods was estimated at 6,050,000,000 marks (1 mark=8 oz. of silver); in 1820 the figure was 6,820,000,000; in 1840, it had reached 11,500,000,000; and by 1850, the estimate was 16,650,000,000. At the beginning of the twentieth century the international turnover had increased to five times as much as in 1850, attaining the figure of 88,500,000,000 marks, which again, by the year 1912, had leapt up to 169,000,000,000 marks. There was a tenfold increase in the variety of the wares which found their way into the world market. By the close of the eighteenth century there appeared in the market, and to an ever larger extent, certain "aristocratic" wares, commodities demanded by the upper classes. Between the Baltic and the north-western coasts of Europe there was a brisk sea-borne traffic in grain and timber. In 1790, London, the largest centre of international commerce, received 580,000 tons of cargo brought to port in vessels. A hundred years later this figure had increased to 7,709,000 tons! The development of the cotton industry made greater and ever greater demands on the cultivation of raw cotton

in the southern States of North America. In 1790, the yield had been 2,000,000 lbs., in 1820 the figure had increased to 180,000,000 lbs. This led to an enormous growth in the import of raw cotton into England. In 1751, the import had amounted to 5,000,000 lbs.; by 1820, this had increased to 142,000,000 lbs.

In the course of the nineteenth century the composition of the freights which found their way into the world market underwent a complete transformation. Wheat, cotton, petroleum, and copper from North America; coffee, guano, Chilian nitre, and meat from South America; wheat, jute, cotton, rice, and tea from Asia; wheat, meat, and wool from Australia—all these manifold cargoes come over the seas in thousands of steam-driven bottoms and fill the world market with commodities.

11. DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPORT UNDER THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM.

"THE revolution in the methods of production in industry and agriculture likewise necessitated a revolution in the general conditions of the social process of production, that is to say in the means of communication and transport. In a society whose pivots (to use Fourier's expression) were, first, small-scale agriculture, with its subsidiary home industries, and, secondly, urban handicraft, the means of communication and transport were utterly inadequate to the requirements of the manufacturing period, with its extended division of social labour, its concentration of the means of labour and of the workers, and its colonial markets; communication and transport, therefore, had to be revolutionised, and were in fact revolutionised. In like manner, the means of transport and communication handed down from the manufacturing period into the period of large-scale industry, soon showed themselves to be an intolerable fetter upon this new type of industry, with its febrile speed of production, its vast gradations, its continual transference of capital and labour from one sphere of production to another, and its newly created ties in the world market. Thus, over and above extensive changes in the construction of sailing ships, the means of communication and transport were gradually adapted, by a system of river steamships, railroads, ocean steamships, and telegraphs, to the methods of production of large-scale industry." (MARX, *Capital*, German, 1, 347-8, English, 1, 406-7.)

In the second half of the eighteenth century, ships voyaging from England to India and back needed eighteen to twenty months to complete the journey. The average burden of such vessels was from 300 to 500 tons. The total tonnage of this sailing fleet was, at the close of the eighteenth century, no more than 1,725,000. With the invention of the steamship, at first propelled by paddles and subsequently by a screw or screws, the growth of both burden and speed took on gigantic proportions for all sea-borne traffic. To-day, freight-vessels have on the average a burden of from ten to twelve thousand tons, and passenger vessels, with a gross tonnage of from forty to fifty thousand, travel at the rate of twenty knots and upwards per hour. According to Norwegian statisticians, the burden of the whole ocean-borne fleet in 1821 amounted to 5,250,000; no more than 0.2 per cent. of the vessels being driven by steam. In 1914, the tonnage amounted to 31,500,000, mainly steamships. As for railroads, the world mileage in 1840 was 4800 miles; in 1850, it was 21,600 miles; in 1870, it was 136,000 miles; and in 1913, it was 690,000 miles. The average speed of goods trains is from 20 to 25 miles per hour; of passenger trains, 35 miles per hour. In 1812, it took five days to travel from Berlin to Vienna; in 1912 the time needed had been reduced to twelve hours. The journey from Berlin to Paris occupied, in 1812, nine days, and in 1912 it needed but seventeen hours. Instead of the forty-eight days required in 1812 to complete the journey between Hamburg and New York, no more than seven days were needed in 1912. From 1840 onward, after the reforms introduced by Rowland Hill (1795-1879), the postal services were organised to cope with the demands of large-scale industry. By the end of the nineteenth century, the services embraced practically the whole globe, providing regular delivery of letters, etc., from Spitzbergen in the north to Punta Arenas on Tierra del Fuego in the south. The establishment of the Postal Union made the whole of the globe into "one postal territory."

The first semaphore, an optical telegraph invented by Claude Chappe (1753-1805), was adopted by the Legislative Assembly in 1792, and proved of great use to the armies of the revolution in their struggle against the monarchical coalition. The most familiar semaphore now-a-days is that used in railway signalling on the block system. But until the invention of the electric telegraph, relays of semaphors were used for transmitting messages over long distances with great speed. During the eighteen thirties an electro-telegraphic apparatus was constructed and Morse (1791-1872), an American, invented a method of recording

which goes by his name to this day. Since 1844, as a means of quick communication to satisfy the needs of the world market and to keep pace with the activity of its development, the electric telegraph has been universally introduced. Only by means of telegrams can the world of commerce be kept informed as to the brisk rise and fall of prices. The whole world has been telegraphically linked up since 1865, when the first submarine cable was laid. By means of the telegraphic system the closest ties have been created between metropolis and colonies, between the commercial undertaking at the centre and its outlying branches. Five million miles of telegraphic communication had been constructed by the close of the nineteenth century. The telephone was introduced in the eighteen seventies, and has since then developed to so great an extent that not only can you speak to your friends in any town or village in the same country, but also across the national frontiers. It is calculated that the telegraph and telephone wires now extend to approximately forty million miles, and that they could be wound around the earth 1,600 times. With the invention of the wireless telegraph and telephone, a new era in the history of the means of communication has begun.

British merchants, by putting a low price on their wares, and especially on cotton goods, ruined the industry of the East Indies. Not content with economic sources of enrichment, without a qualm of conscience they turned to political methods. Thus, they forced the Chinese to accept the import of opium at the cannon's mouth. In like manner, short work was made of the Japanese hostility to foreign commerce. In this case, the United States' navy did the work instead of the British. By the Perry Convention of 1854, the Harris Convention of 1857, and the Yedo Treaty of 1858, the Japanese were compelled to open certain ports to western trade.

12. CLEAVAGE BETWEEN TOWN AND COUNTRYSIDE.

"THREE centuries were needed for Germany to establish the first large-scale division of labour, the separation of town from countryside. In so far as only in this respect the relation between town and countryside was changed, the whole of society was changed likewise. Let us consider no more than this single aspect of the division of labour and note the contrast between the classical slave-holding republics, on the one hand, and Christian feudalism on the other ; or, again, the contrast

between old England with her titled landowners, on the one hand, and modern England with her cotton lords, on the other. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when as yet colonial possessions were not, when the Americans did not exist so far as Europeans were concerned and traffic with Asia was conducted through Constantinople, when the Mediterranean Sea was the pivot of commercial activity—in those days, the division of labour [in society] was completely different from the division of labour during the seventeenth century, when Spain, Portugal, Holland, England, and France were acquiring colonial possessions in every corner of the globe.” (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, Published by B. P. H., P. 101.) Marx returns to this subject in *Capital*, and adds: “The foundation of all highly developed division of labour that is brought about by the exchange of commodities is the cleavage between town and country. We may say that the whole economic history of society is summarised in the development of this cleavage between town and country.” (Marx, *Capital* I, 371-2.)

Large-scale industry dealt a decisive blow to old-fashioned methods of agriculture. It uprooted the peasant from the deadening conditions of rural life. “In the domain of agriculture, the most revolutionary effect of large-scale industry is that it destroys the bulwark of the old society, the peasant, who is replaced by a wage-worker. In this way the need for social transformations, and the oppositions, of the countryside are equated with those of the town. . . . The capitalist method of production completely severs the old bond of union between agriculture and manufacture, which were held together when both were in their infancy.” (Marx, *Capital*, I, 546.)

We may judge by the following figures how rapid was the growth of the town populations at the expense of the countryside during the early decades of the nineteenth century. In 1800, the population of London was 959,000; by 1850, it had increased to 2,363,000. Between 1800 and 1850, the population of Paris grew from 547,000 to 1,053,000. In the same period of time, the population of New York City increased from 64,000 to 612,000. The growth of population in the new industrial centres such as Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, and Bradford was even more speedy. But this was as nothing compared to the increase of town population during the second half of the century.

		1850		1900
Vienna	..	444,000	..	1,675,000
St. Petersburg	..	485,000	..	1,133,000

		1850		1900
Berlin	419,000	..	1,889,000
Munich	110,000	..	500,000
Essen	9,000	..	119,000
Leipzig	63,000	..	456,000
Chicago	30,000	..	1,699,000
New York City	612,000	..	3,437,000

Already in the year 1851 the urban population of England and Wales had risen to 8,991,000 thus constituting 50 per cent. of the whole population of the country. By 1901, the figure had grown to 28,169,000 or 88 per cent. of the whole population. The rapidity of the growth of population in England and Wales may be gleaned from the following figures:

Year				Population
1690	5,000,000
1801	9,000,000
1851	17,900,000
1901	32,500,000

In 1800, the density of population in England and Wales was about 146 to the square mile; in 1840 it was 265; and in 1901 it was 540.

13. THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL.

THE accumulation of capital in the hands of individual capitalists proceeds along two paths. First of all it accumulates automatically by means of the profit extracted from labour (concentration of capital); and, secondly, it accumulates by means of the aggregation of the capital owned by individual capitalists in the hands of joint-stock companies, trusts, syndicates, and cartels (centralisation of capital).

The total taxable income in the United Kingdom amounted in 1856 to £307,068,898; in 1865, to £385,530,020; in 1882, to £601,450,977; and in 1912, to £1,111,456,413. Add to these figures the whole non-assessed income, and we obtain the total of £2,200,000,000. Half of this income accrues to one-eighth of the population. The number of joint-stock companies in England amounted to 8192 in the year 1884. By 1900, the number had grown to 29,730; by 1916, to 66,094. Correspondingly, the capital in these companies grew from £480,000,000 in 1884 to £1,640,000,000 in 1900, and £2,720,000,000 in 1916.

The national wealth of France for the years 1909 to 1913 was

reckoned at frs. 225,000,000,000, which was divided up among 11,634,000 persons. Among these, there were 98,243 persons each of whom possessed more than frs. 250,000, the gross amount of their possessions reaching the figure of frs. 106,000,000,000, that is to say nearly half of the whole national wealth. If we put aside the very wealthy, numbering, say, 18,586 persons, possessing, in all, frs. 60,500,000,000, there remain as property owners rather less than 9,500,000 persons owning more than frs. 10,000 each, their total wealth being frs. 66,000,000,000.

In Prussia, there were 8,570,418 persons with incomes under 900 marks. Taken all together, these incomes amounted to less than the totalised incomes of the 146,000 persons in a higher category. Persons in receipt of an income in excess of 100,000 marks numbered in

Year				Individuals
1913	4,747
1914	5,215
1917	13,327

The national wealth of the United States was in 1850, \$7,100,000,000; in 1870 it was \$30,000,000,000; and in 1900 it was \$88,500,000,000. By the year 1912 it had increased to \$187,000,000,000; and, according to the calculations of certain economists, in 1920 it had reached the figure of \$500,000,000,000. In 1917 there were 19,103 persons each in receipt of \$50,000 a year and more; among these, 141 had incomes of over \$10,000,000. Capital invested in manufacturing industry amounted: in 1899 to \$8,900,000,000, and in 1914 to \$22,700,000,000. The capital invested in railways amounted in 1899 to \$11,000,000,000, and in 1914 to \$20,200,000,000.

The National City Bank, which is controlled by the big trusts, had already in 1879 a capital of \$16,700,000. By 1899, this capital had increased to \$128,000,000, and to-day it amounts to \$1,000,000,000.

At a time when the United States comprises 7 per cent. of the whole territory of the globe whereas its population amounts to no more than 6 per cent. of the world's population, this capitalist republic produces 20 per cent. of the world's gold production, 25 per cent. of the world's wheat, 40 per cent. of the world's steel and iron, 40 per cent. of the world's lead, 40 per cent. of the world's silver, 50 per cent. of the world's zinc, 52 per cent. of the world's coal, 60 per cent. of the world's copper, 60 per cent. of the world's cotton, 60 per cent. of the world's mineral oil, 75 per cent. of the world's grain, and 85 per cent. of the

world's automobiles. The whole of this production is in the hands of a few trusts, at the head of which are some twenty multi-millionaires such as Rockefeller, Morgan, Ford, MacCormick and Armour.

14. CAPITALISM AND MAN'S CONQUEST OVER NATURE

Down to the year 1848, the conquest of nature by man had gone forward very slowly. Still, together with the better utilisation of wind and water, the use of steam power had advanced apace after the general adoption of Watt's inventions. Ever since 1820, one discovery after another had been made in the field of electric phenomena by such men as Oersted (1777-1851), Seebeck (1770-1831), and Faraday (1791-1867). But, with the exception of the electric telegraph and electro-metallurgy, these discoveries had not been turned to account in manufacturing industry. During the last third of the nineteenth century, however, a new branch of industry arose, that of electrotechnics.

The application of chemical science to agriculture, or agricultural chemistry as it is sometimes called, is due in the main to a German, Justus von Liebig (1803-1873), though we may likewise mention in this connection the Englishman Humphrey Davy (1778-1829), whose book on the Elements of Agricultural Chemistry had appeared in 1813. Liebig's first publication on the subject (entitled *Die Chemie in ihrer Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie* which was at once translated into English by Lyon Playfair, 1818-1898, under the title of *Chemistry of Agriculture*) appeared in 1840. Marx writes: "One of Liebig's immortal services has been that he has expounded the negative or destructive aspects of modern agriculture, and that he has done this from the outlook of natural science." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 548, note.) Just before, in the text, we read: "With the constantly increasing preponderance of urban population aggregated in the great centres, capitalist production increases, on the one hand, the mobility of society, while destroying, on the other, the interchange of material between man and the soil, that is to say the return to the soil of its constituents that are used by human beings in the form of food and clothing—a return which is the permanent natural essential for the maintenance of the fertility of the soil." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 546-547).

Liebig was the first to show that the reason why the soil became exhausted was because the relations of exchange between man and the earth he cultivated had become disturbed, for, in the processes of

growth, the crops extracted from the soil certain substances which man failed to return thither. One of the characteristics of the capitalistic economy and its separation of the town from the village is that it robs the soil of many fertilising substances without returning these in the form of natural manure. Under a natural economy, when the fruits of the earth were consumed almost entirely in the locality where they were produced, the natural manure created by the consumers both human and animal sufficed for the replenishing of the soil. But with the growth of larger and larger towns, the consumption of agricultural produce took place away from the seat of cultivation, and the natural fertilising material ran to waste. With the loss of natural manure it became necessary to discover artificial fertilisers in order to return to the soil the minerals which had been used up in the growth of the crops. Liebig contended that the supply of mineral constituents is limited because the soil cannot furnish an unrestricted quantity of them; hence the chief care of the farmer, and the function of manures, must be to restore to the soil those minerals which each crop is found, on analysis, to take up in its growth. An artificial manure was, therefore, prepared containing the essential mineral substances, such as phosphoric acid, potassium, and nitrogen. From the eighteen forties onward, the use of artificial manures became more and more generalised. So we use manufactured nitrogenous manures, fertilisers such as superphosphate and basic slag, dissolved bones, and compound manures. Basic slag is a waste product of steel-making, and its fertilising properties were not discovered till 1878.

The application of chemistry to industrial production was introduced towards the close of the eighteenth century. About the year 1787, Nichols Leblanc (1742-1806) turned his attention to the urgent problem of manufacturing carbonate of soda from sea-salt. His work in these experiments led, in 1790, to the foundation of the huge industry of artificial alkali manufacture, the products of which are used for bleaching purposes (especially for some kinds of paper), and in the making of fireworks, safety matches, soap, textile fabrics, dyes, etc. The first practical application of coal-gas as an illuminant is usually ascribed to William Murdoch (1754-1839), who made experiments demonstrating the possibilities in this direction between the years 1792 and 1802. The matter was carried a stage further by a German who came to England in 1804, took the Lyceum Theatre, and gave demonstrations of his process. The result was that in 1807 public gas-lighting began in London with the installation of the new system in Pall Mall.

The chief solid residue from the distillation of coal is coke ; the liquid residue consists of tar and ammoniacal liquor. Among by-products we have benzene, aniline dyes, various disinfectants, naphthalene, saccharin, etc. The processes and extent of the manufacture of soap-making and candle-making were revolutionised in the beginning of the nineteenth century by Chevreuil's (1786-1889) investigations on fats and oils, and by Leblanc's (1742-1806) discoveries regarding the manufacture of caustic soda from common salt. But it was not until the eighteen-fifties, some years after the first publication of the Manifesto, that a new era in the application of chemical research to industrial processes began. Not long after the year 1848, the industrial revolution in textile production, which had hitherto been mainly confined to the spinning and weaving processes, now entered its final stage with the improvement in the fields of dyeing and finishing. In 1856, W. H. Perkin (1838-1907) prepared the first aniline dye, namely, the purple colouring matter called mauve. The discovery of other brilliant dyestuffs from the distilling of coal-tar followed in rapid succession, and at the present time it may be said that the dyer is provided with an embarrassing number of dyestuffs capable of producing every variety of colour, possessing the most diversified properties, many of the colours produced being fugitive, but a considerable number being permanent and capable of withstanding various influences.

The bringing of distant parts of the earth under cultivation (a process to which Marx and Engels refer in the text) had by 1848 passed through its early stages. In 1815, the United States of America was beginning to become the main centre of cotton cultivation. The United States production of cotton in the year 1800 had amounted to 73,000 bales; but by 1840 this had increased to 1,348,000 bales. During the years following 1850, the growth of grain production in the United States took on an even speedier pace. In 1840, the production of wheat amounted to 84,800,000 bushels; but during the five years 1901-1905 the yearly average was 662,000,000 bushels of wheat. As for the total production of all varieties of grain: this was 377,000,000 bushels in 1848; whilst in the years 1901-1905 the average yearly production was 2,100,000,000 bushels. The opening up of Canada, South America, Australia, Siberia, Africa, etc., was begun after 1850.

The utilisation of rivers for navigation was, down to the latter third of the eighteenth century, carried on by old-fashioned methods. In England the construction of canals was started in the middle of the eighteenth century, and in France, too, a network of canals came into

existence. The canals made in the early days of canal construction were mostly of the type known as barge or boat canals, and, owing to their limited depth and breadth, were only available for vessels of small size. The development of canals was due to the urgent needs of a growing commerce. As the technique of canal construction improved, the channels were deepened and widened to such a size as to accommodate sea-going ships. These ship-canal have mostly been constructed, either to shorten the voyage between two seas by cutting through an intervening isthmus (the Caledonian Canal and the Suez Canal, for example); or they have been made in order to convert important inland places into sea-ports (Manchester Ship Canal and the Zeebrugge-Bruges Canal in Flanders). The tortuous windings of rivers have been avoided by making cuts from one loop to another, and the falls in the river beds have been rendered navigable by means of weirs and locks. The channels and the mouths of rivers are kept clear by means of dredging machines, usually driven by steam-power. It was not until the introduction of railways on the large scale that canal development ceased.

15. A FEW WORDS CONCERNING THE THEORY AND HISTORY OF CRISES.

In his book describing the conditions of the English working class, Engels deals at some length with the question of crises. He shows that they arise out of the very nature of capitalist production and competition. "The anarchic conditions of modern production and distribution of products, conditions of production which are governed by profit instead of by the satisfaction of needs, conditions under which every one works on his own independent line in the endeavour to enrich himself—such conditions cannot fail to result in frequent stagnation. At the outset of the era of industrial development, stagnation was confined to one or another branch of industry or to one market, but since the centralisation of the activities of competitors, the workers, deprived of work in one branch of industry, invade another branch, choosing by preference one that is easy to learn. Thus the commodities which do not find a buyer in one market make their way into another, and so on. These little crises gradually coalesce to become in due time crises on the large scale. Crises such as these have been wont to occur every five years, following a short period of expansion and general prosperity." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 84, English Translation, p. 82.)

Elsewhere Engels speaks of five-year or six-year cycles, and in

his *Principles of Communism* he mentions seven-year periods. "During the whole of this century, industrial life has fluctuated between times of prosperity and times of crisis; at intervals of from five to seven years a similar crisis has recurred, bringing in its train the intolerable wretchedness of the workers, and a general revolutionary effervescence, and exposing the extant order of society to the greatest dangers." (See, in Appendix to present work, Engels' *Principles of Communism*, the answer to Question Twelve).

Not until a good many years after 1848, when Marx was writing *Capital*, did he come to recognise that such cycles of fluctuation between prosperity and slump embraced, not five or even seven years, but, rather, periods lasting ten and eleven years.

The first crisis to take on national proportions occurred in the years 1825-1826. It was preceded by an outburst of speculative activity, which received its initial impetus from the opening up of the South American market. The next generalised crisis took place in 1836-1837. This was preceded by a colossal growth in British industry and export, the latter more especially finding an outlet in North America. The year 1847 gave the signal for a third grave crisis, the slump which speedily followed the "railway mania" of 1845 and 1846, when capital had been poured with feverish haste into the construction of railways.

The speed with which the railways were constructed, at first requiring as many men as possible, subsequently threw something like 50,000 men out of work. In addition, the crisis affected the cotton industry, iron works, and mining. At the height of the crisis, which embraced Great Britain, America, and, indeed, the whole of the continent of Europe (Russia excepted) and prepared the way for the revolutionary upheaval of 1848, Marx, at the request of the Communist League, penned the Manifesto.

16. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE PROLETARIAT

"PROLETARIAN" now means one whose only means of livelihood is the sale of his labour power. Its original significance, in the Latin form *proletarius*, was not quite the same. In the days of ancient Rome, *proletarius* signified one whose sole wealth consisted of his descendants, his offspring (*proles*). At the outset the proletariat, the poorest class of the Roman population, was freed from military service and the pay-

ment of taxes. Later on, the proletarian was admitted to the army, and received an outfit from the State. In the epoch of the civil wars, when the Roman peasantry was already ruined, and subsequently under the empire, the proletariat constituted the very kernel of the army. In times of peace this body of men was maintained at the expense of the State, and received regular rations of corn. There is little in common between these Roman proletarians and the landless and homeless European proletarians of our own day, save only the name. Nor must we overlook, as Marx points out, "that in classical Rome the class war was carried on only within the pale of a privileged minority, between the free rich and the free poor. The slaves, who formed the great productive mass of the population, were nothing more than a passive pedestal upon which the struggle was waged. People have forgotten Sismondi's notable utterance. 'The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society, whereas modern society lives at the expense of the proletariat.'" (Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, pp. 18-19).

The word *proletariat* to describe the class of the wage workers did not come into general use until the first half of the nineteenth century. In the foreword to the original German edition of his book on the condition of the working class in England, a book wherein for the first time a detailed study of the English proletariat down to the eighteenth century was undertaken, Engels tells us that he makes use of the words "worker, proletarian, working class, non-possessing class, and proletariat" to describe one and the same phenomenon. Elsewhere he writes: "The proletariat is that class of society whose means of livelihood entirely depends on the sale of its labour [labour power] and not on the profits derived from capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence, depend upon the demand for labour [labour power], depend upon the alternations of good times and bad, upon the fluctuations which are the outcome of unbridled competition. The proletariat, or class of proletarians, is, in a word, the working class of the nineteenth century." (See Appendix, *Principles of Communism*, answer to Question Two). A class of wage labourers or proletarians arose in England in the latter half of the fourteenth century. During the course of one hundred and fifty years it constituted the lower strata of the population, and only by degrees separated itself from the ranks of artisans, craftsmen, and peasants, and freed itself from feudal bonds.

As far as social status was concerned, the proletariat in the very early days of its existence was but slightly differentiated from other workers engaged in the crafts or in husbandry. But as capitalism developed, the proletariat assumed special characteristics of its own. The difference between the proletariat and the free peasant and craftsman consists in the fact that the proletarian worker is deprived of the means of production, that he has to labour, not on his own account (like the peasant and the craftsman), but for the benefit of another, for the benefit of the owner of capital. He sells himself, his labour power, as though this were a commodity, and in exchange he receives a wage.

So long as capitalism was still in its infancy, so long as the feudal authorities in the rural districts and the trade corporations in the towns were hindering the conversion of money capital and merchant capital into industrial capital, so long as the new manufacturing industry could only raise its head among those urban settlements that were not under guild jurisdiction—the wage workers, the proletarians, despite repressive legislation, were able to make the most of the growing demand for their services which resulted from the accumulation of capital. After the spoliation of the ecclesiastical domains in the sixteenth century, after the distribution of State properties and the widespread enclosures of communal lands, whereby hundreds of thousands of peasants were deprived of their means of livelihood and forced into the highways and byways in the vain search for work, the condition of the wage earners suddenly changed greatly for the worse. The growth of manufacture, the accumulation of capital so necessary to the upbuilding of independent undertakings, deprived the wage worker of all hope of ever becoming a master on his own account—for even the independent crafts were now more and more being replaced by capitalist undertakings. It is true that manufacturing industry was able only gradually (in the course of a hundred years or so from the second half of the seventeenth to the second half of the eighteenth century) to gain control of both urban and rural production. But the ranks of the proletariat were continuously swelled by the addition of artisans and rural home workers. Meanwhile, in spite of these new components, the proletariat became more and more differentiated as a class. Not until the advent of large-scale machinofacture did the urban craftsman and the rural home workers completely disappear. They were then thrown piecemeal into the ranks of the proletariat, and were thus deprived of all possibility of returning to their “primitive state.” It was the introduction of

machinofacture on the large scale which created a class of persons who brought their own skins to market, who cast their own bodies into the whirlpool of competition in their search for a job.

"Competition," writes Engels, "is the most complete expression of the war of all against all which is dominant in modern bourgeois society. This war, a war for life, for existence, for everything—in the case of need, therefore, a struggle to the death—is not waged only between the various classes of society, but also between the individual members of these classes. Every one is in every one else's way; and consequently every one tries to thrust aside and to take the places of those who are in his way. The workers compete one with another, just as the bourgeois compete one with another. The power-loom weaver competes with the handloom weaver; the unemployed or badly paid handloom weaver competes with and tries to replace his mate who is employed or better paid. This competition of the workers one with another is the worst side of extant conditions so far as the workers are concerned, for it provides the bourgeoisie with its most effective weapon against the proletariat." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., pp. 77-8; cf. English translation, pp. 75-6).

17. THE DIVISION OF LABOUR DURING THE EPOCHS OF MANUFACTURE AND LARGE-SCALE PRODUCTION (MACHINOFACTURE).

THE craftsman makes every part, one after the other, of the object which at the end of his labours becomes a ware ready for sale. Even at the height of the guild development, the number of subdivisions in the realm of production was very small. But with the rise of manufacture, a purely mechanical division of labour occurred, whereby a labourer came to perform no more than one single part of an operation in the process of producing a finished commodity. Yet even in this period the division of labour in the detailed processes of production occurred in certain branches of industry only, and not in others. Besides, under manufacture the whole of production was performed by the hands of the worker, and depended upon his deftness and ability.

"In manufacture and in handicrafts, the worker uses a tool; in the factory, he serves a machine. In the former case, the movements of the instrument of labour proceed from the worker; but in the latter, the movements of the worker are subordinate to those of the machine. In manufacture, the workers are parts of a living mechanism. In the

factory, there exists a lifeless mechanism independent of them, and they are incorporated into that mechanism as its living appendages. The dull routine of a ceaseless drudgery and toil, in which the same mechanical process is incessantly repeated, resembles the torment of Sisyphus—the toil, like the rock, recoils perpetually upon the wearied operative. While labour at the machine has a most depressing effect upon the nervous system, it at the same time hinders the multifarious activity of the muscles, and prohibits free bodily and mental activity. Even the lightening of the labour becomes a means of torture, for the machine does not free the worker from his work, but merely deprives his work of interest.” (Marx. *Capital*, I, 451. The passage comparing the worker at the machine to Sisyphus is quoted by Marx from Engels’ *Lage der arbeitenden Klasse*, 1845 edition, p. 217, and by Engels from James Phillips Kay, M.D., *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester*, Ridgeway, London, 1832, page 8.)

Machine production calls for an increase in the supply of raw material, half-finished goods, tools, etc., and leads to the creation of more and more branches of industry. The working-up of all these raw materials and half-finished wares is carried out by innumerable new varieties and sub-varieties of processes whereby the number of “trades” is greatly increased. According to German statistics, the number of trades and occupations in 1882 was reckoned as amounting to 6,000; in 1895 there were approximately 10,000.

Large-scale industry under capitalism thus not only sweeps away the old division of labour with its hard-and-fast specialisations, but enormously increases the number of specialised processes. The condition of the detail worker is thereby rendered even worse than before, seeing that he now become entirely dependent upon the hazards of events, thus endangering the safety and solidity of the material basis of his life.

18. LABOUR AND LABOUR POWER.

MARX and Engels make use here of a terminology which in later years they discarded. Labour, as a commodity, is differentiated from labour in so far as its quantity determines the value of a commodity. Instead of continuing to speak of “labour” as a commodity, Marx later introduced the term “labour power” to denote the worker’s capacity to perform work, his ability to produce a product. The worker, deprived of the means of production, is not in a position to set his capa-

cities to the task of production until he himself goes to market and sells his own labour power as a commodity. Marx and Engels likewise modified their views as to what determines the price of labour as a commodity, or the price of labour power. Both in his *Umriss zu einer Kritik der Nationalökonomie* and in his book on the condition of the working class in England, Engels comes to the conclusion that the price of labour is determined by the same laws as that of any other commodity, *i.e.*, the cost of its production, which as far as the workman is concerned is the cost of the means of subsistence necessary to keep him fit to labour. The price of "labour," *i.e.*, of labour power, the wage of labour, is, therefore, the minimum of that which is essential to the maintenance of life. Marx agreed with his conclusion. In his *Poverty of Philosophy*, and again in *Wage Labour and Capital*, he defines the wages of labour as follows: "The cost of production of simple labour [labour power] amounts to the expenditure needed for the maintenance of the worker and his reproduction. The maintenance of the worker and his reproduction is paid for in wages. The wage thus determined goes by the name of minimum wage. This minimum wage concerns the human species in general and not the individual worker—just as the price of commodities in general is determined by the cost of production. Certain workers, nay millions of individual workers, do not receive enough wages to maintain life and reproduce their kind. But within the framework of their own fluctuations, the wages of the working class as a whole adjust themselves to this minimum." (Marx, *Lohnarbeit und Kapital*, p. 24.)

Lassalle adopted this formulation, and described it as the "iron law of wages," a phrase which has no more than a propaganda value.

In *Capital*, Marx shows that the value of labour power, as of all other commodities, is determined by the labour time necessary for its production, and the labour time necessary for the production of labour power amounts to the labour time necessary for the production of the means of subsistence wherewith the worker satisfies his need for food, clothing, shelter, etc. But the dimensions of these fundamental needs, the extent to which they can be satisfied and the ability to satisfy them, are the outcome of historical determinants. They depend in large measure upon the cultural development of the country with which we are concerned, and, among other things, upon the conditions under which the class of free labourers came into being, upon the habits this class formed and upon the standard of life it claimed for itself.

Thus, in contrast with other commodities, the determination of the value of labour power depends partly upon historical and moral factors. The lowest estimate of the value of labour power is formed upon the bare cost of the material needs for the maintenance of life. If the price of labour power (wages) falls to the minimum, then it falls below the value of labour power. Under such conditions, labour power can be maintained only to an insufficient degree. Marx further shows that in a capitalist society the worker is only offered the privilege of working to produce his own subsistence provided that he is willing, in addition, to work a certain amount of unpaid time in which he produces surplus value for the capitalist. Marx also explains the conditions which enable the capitalists to increase the amount of unpaid labour. This is effected by lengthening the working day, by the intensification of labour, by increasing the productivity of labour. Consequently the capitalists are able to lower the price of labour power, to lower wages, more and more, to a point below the value of labour power. (See the detailed discussion—of which the foregoing is a summary—in *Capital*, I, 158-165.)

19. FACTORY DESPOTISM.

“THE technical subordination of the worker to the uniform movement of the instrument of labour, and the peculiar composition of the working body (which is made up of individuals of both sexes and various ages), give rise to a barrack-like discipline, which is elaborated into a complete factory system, involving a full development of the previously described work of supervision—this meaning the division of the workers into operatives and overlookers, into the private soldiers and the non-commissioned officers of an industrial army. . . . The factory code (in which capital formulates its autocracy over its workers—in a private legislative system, and without the partition of authority and the representative methods which in other fields are so much loved by the bourgeoisie) is only the capitalist caricature of that social regulation of the labour process which becomes necessary when co-operation is undertaken upon a large scale and when joint instruments of labour in the form of machinery are set to work. In place of the slave driver's lash, we have the overlooker's book of penalties. Of course, all the punishments take the form of fines and reductions from wages; and the legislative talent of the factory Lycurgus is utilised in such a way that, as far as possible, a breach of the regulations is made even more

profitable to the employer than their strict observance." (*Capital*, I, 453-4.)

In this connection Marx quotes Engels who, twenty years earlier, had given so vivid a picture of factory despotism in his book on the condition of the working class in England: "Nowhere is the slavery imposed on the proletariat by the bourgeoisie so glaringly manifest as in the factory. Here, both legally and in actual fact, freedom is at an end. The worker must be at the factory by half-past five in the morning. Should he come a minute or two late, he is fined; should he be ten minutes after time, he is not admitted until breakfast is over, and he thus loses a quarter of a day's wages. He must eat, drink, and sleep at the word of command. . . . The despotic whistle summons him up from his bed, calls him away from his breakfast and his dinner. And what happens, once he is inside the factory? There, the factory owner is an absolute legislator. He issues factory regulations according to his own sweet will and pleasure; he alters his code and makes additions to it just as he likes; and even if he issues the most absurd regulations, the courts say to the worker: 'Since you entered into this contract of your own free will, you must abide by it' . . . These workers are sentenced to life under the rod (both actually and metaphorically) from the age of nine until the day of their death." (*Capital*, I, 453).

The repulsive form of factory despotism in the Russia of pre-revolutionary days, the degree of refinement to which the system of penalties was brought by the Russian factory owners, is admirably depicted in Lenin's pamphlet [Explanation of the Law about Punishments] which was first published in 1897.

20. LABOUR OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

"IN so far as machinery does away with the need for any considerable expenditure of muscular power, it becomes a means for the utilisation of workers with comparatively little strength, and those whose bodily growth is immature but whose limbs are all the more supple. The labour of women and children was, therefore, the first word in the capitalist utilisation of machinery! This mighty substitute for work and workers speedily transformed itself into a means for increasing the number of wage workers by enlisting all the members of the working-class family, without distinction of sex or age, to bring them under the direct sway of capital. Forced labour for the capitalist usurped the

place, not only of the children's play, but also of free labour in the domestic circle, carried on for the family itself, and within moderate limits." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 418-9).

Instead of one adult worker by his labour providing his family with food, under capitalism the whole family was swept into the factory and put to work. It might even happen that there would be no jobs left for grown men, who would then be forced to seek employment in some other industry, or else have to look to their children for support. In the English textile industry, for every thousand men employed, there were in 1861: in the cotton trade 567 women workers (in 1901 there were 628); in the woollen trade 461 women (in 1901 there were 582); in the silk trade 642 (in 1901 there were 702). In 1841, in ten different branches of industry, such as the potteries, chemicals, textiles, foods, the ratio of men to women employed was 1,030,600 men to 463,000 women; in 1891, it was 1,576,100 men to 1,447,500 women. As far as Germany is concerned, for every hundred male workers in the textile industry there were 38 women employed in 1882; 45 in 1895; 50 in 1907. And in the production of clothing, for every hundred men employed there were 40 women in 1882; 45 in 1895; and 51 in 1907.

21. WORKER GIVES CREDIT TO CAPITALIST.

"IN countries where the capitalist method of production has become established, labour power is not paid for until it has functioned throughout the period specified in the contract; not, for instance, until the end of the week. Everywhere, therefore, the worker advances to the capitalist the use-value of his labour power; the seller of labour power allows the buyer to consume its use-value before the seller gets the price; everywhere the worker gives credit to the capitalist. That this credit is not a mere fiction we may learn, not only from the occasional loss of wages when a capitalist goes bankrupt, but also from the study of more lasting consequences." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 162.)

Marx has a note here, giving data to show how shopkeepers make use of the worker's position as a worker whose wages are only paid at the end of a week to charge him more because he has to buy what he needs on credit.

Even worse is the position of the worker who receives his wages at the end of a fortnight or a month. He is forced to pay higher prices, and is in actual fact enslaved to the shopkeeper who supplies the goods

on credit. The commodities the worker buys are of inferior quality, if they are not actually adulterated. The adulteration of foodstuff took on enormous proportions during the nineteenth century. In the same way the workers are at the mercy of the landlord in the matter of housing. The more wretched the dwelling, the more it costs to keep in repair, and the most expensive quarters are precisely those occupied by the poorest class of the population. "Speculators in houses exploit the mines of poverty with so much profit and so little cost as would have made the mouths of those who owned the silver mines of Potosi water." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 727.)

22. THE PETTY AND MIDDLE BOURGEOISIE FALL INTO THE RANKS OF THE PROLETARIAT.

"THE working class is likewise swelled by persons drawn from the higher strata of society. Numerous petty industrials and lesser recipients of unearned income find their way into the ranks of the proletariat, and, side by side with the workers, offer their hands for sale in the labour market. The forest of uplifted arms begging for work becomes ever denser, whilst the arms themselves grow thinner and thinner. It is obvious that the small producer cannot keep up a struggle wherein the first condition of success is production on the large scale; in other words he cannot be a small producer and a large-scale producer at one and the same time. Nor need I dwell upon the fact that the interest on capital decreases in the same ratio as capital itself grows, as the mass of capital and the dimension of capital increase. The lesser recipient of unearned income finds it ever more difficult to live on the interest from his capital. He is therefore obliged to become actively engaged in the industrial process, that is to say, he helps to fill the ranks of the smallscale factory owners who are themselves qualifying for entry into the proletarian army." (Marx, *Lohnarbeit und Kapital*, p. 39).

23. VARIOUS FORMS OF WORKING-CLASS PROTEST AGAINST CAPITALISM.

CAPITALIST society degrades the workers to the level of inanimate objects. The worker can maintain his feeling of human dignity only by protesting against such a position, only by fighting against capitalism and its upholders the capitalists, only by rebelling against the bourgeoisie, only by detestation of the bourgeois social order. In his *Condition*

of the *Working Class in England*, Engels writes: "The revolt of the workers against the bourgeoisie began soon after industry in the modern sense had passed through its earlier stages of development. . . . This revolt, in its earliest, crudest, and least fruitful expression, took the form of crime. The worker lived in poverty and want; he saw that others lived in happier circumstances. He could not understand why he, who did more for the community than did the wealthy idler, should be the one to suffer. Need overcome his traditional respect for property—and he stole. As industry progressed, crime grew accordingly, and the yearly number of arrests corresponded with the yearly consumption of bales of cotton. Soon, however, the workers came to realise that crime did not help them. Only as an individual, only in isolation, could the criminal make his protest against the existing form of society, and the whole weight of society was brought to bear upon each criminal, crushing him with its overwhelming might. Theft was the most primitive form of protest and for this very reason never became a general expression of working-class opinion even though the workers might condone it in their secret hearts." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., pp. 216-7; cf. English translation, pp. 213-4.) Very much the same holds good in regard to another form of protest which is met with in the early days of capitalist development, namely the killing of factory owners, of overseers, and so forth.

The first form of collective protest was the factory riot, fomented in order to destroy property and, in especial, to smash the machinery. The fight of the worker against the machine began at the very outset of the invention of new machinery. But mass action took place only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Under the nickname of "Luddites" the workers started an organised campaign of destruction of machinery in Nottingham, Yorkshire, and Lancashire. The rioters made their first appearance in Nottingham and the neighbouring districts towards the end of 1811. They began by destroying the lace and stocking frames. The leader of the bands was known as General Ludd, a mythical figure in whose name deeds of violence were perpetrated against the factory owners, industrial property was destroyed, and machines were smashed to smithereens. The police were powerless to cope with the Luddites and the government had to have recourse to the army in order to quell the rising. Legislation was introduced whereby the death penalty could be pronounced against any worker who should be proved to have destroyed machinery. A notable feature in the opposition to this severely repressive legislation was Lord

Byron's (1788-1824) speech in the House of Lords. In this speech he gave a graphic account of the misery among the Nottingham workers. A spirited and imaginative description of the Luddite movement will be found in Ernst Toller's play, *The Machine Wreckers*. The movement revived in 1812; and in January 1813, three men were hanged. During the week following the attack on Cartwright's factory, fourteen men were executed. As late as 1817, more Luddites were executed at Derby. With the aid of provocative agents, the government finally destroyed the organisation. With reviving prosperity in industry, in part also as an outcome of Cobbett's (1762-1835) agitation whereby the workers were made to realise the foolishness of destroying machinery (a realisation prompted by their growing intelligence), the Luddite movement came to an end. Of course this means of protest in its more elemental form continued to adapt itself to circumstances and was resorted to from time to time whenever new machinery was introduced. Thus, in the eighteen-thirties the "red cock" crowed all over the English countryside, *i.e.*, ricks were fired and barns set ablaze by agricultural labourers under the leadership of "Jack Swing"—a mythical figure like "General Ludd."

A similar movement occurred in Germany during the eighteenth-forties among the Silesian weavers. It was described by Marx's friend Wilhelm Wolff, and served Gerhart Hauptmann as subject for his famous play *The Weavers*. In Russia, riots for the smashing of machinery took place during the eighties and nineties of the last century. "Time and experience were needed before the workpeople could learn to distinguish between machinery itself and the use of machinery by capital; and until they could come to direct their attacks, not against the material instruments of production, but against the particular social form in which these instruments are used." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 458.)

24. THE PROLETARIANS AS PAWNS IN THE BOURGEOIS GAME.

IN the twenties and thirties (1820-1840), the British and the French bourgeoisies assumed the role of leaders of the workers, using the proletarians as pawns in the bourgeois game. At this time, writes Marx: "On the one hand, large-scale industry was . . . only emerging from its childhood. This we can see from the fact that the cyclical character of the life of modern industry only began to become apparent

with the crisis of 1825. On the other hand, the class struggle between capital and labour was forced into the background; politically, by the fight between the governments and the feudalists grouped round the Holly Alliance, as one of the contending parties, and the mass of the people led by the bourgeoisie, as the other; economically, by the feud between industrial capital and aristocratic landed property, which in France was masked by the conflict between small-scale and large-scale landed property, but in England broke out into open warfare upon the question of the Corn Laws." (Marx, preface to the second German edition of *Capital*.)

In England, the workers helped the bourgeoisie in its struggle to establish the principle of free trade, to repeal the Corn Laws, to reform the criminal code and the civil, to widen the franchise, and so forth.

Even economists like Ricardo (1772-1823), jurists like Bentham (1748-1832), and politicians like Joseph Hume (1777-1855), wielded much authority among the workers. It was not until after 1830, when the radical wing of the bourgeoisie so light-heartedly accepted the compromise which conferred political power upon the industrial capitalists, that a profound cleavage occurred between the advance guard of the working class and the bourgeoisie.

From 1815 to 1830, during the Restoration period, the French liberal bourgeoisie passed through a similar course of development. It led the mass of the people in the struggle against the feudal asitocracy and the monarchical power of the Bourbons; it acted as the guide, philosopher, and friend of the exploited; in the most skilful way imaginable, it was careful to keep out of sight the antagonism of interest between the industrial capitalists and the landed aristocracy, and the antagonism of interests between itself and the working class. But the epoch of the July revolution and the risings of the Lyons operatives in 1831 and 1834 opened the eyes of the workers, and led them to formulate political outlooks on their own account and to assume the role which down to those years had been played by the radical wing of the bourgeois party.

25. ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

ENGELS was the first who endeavoured to give a theoretical exposition of the course of trade union development among the workers. Differing

from the economists and socialists of his day, he showed as early as 1845 that trade unions are the inevitable result of the struggle between workers and industrialists, and that trade unions must form the basis of all working-class organisation. At the outset, combinations of workers took on a merely fugitive shape, being created during the progress of a strike. Since all combinations were prohibited by law, since all working-class societies and associations were transgressions of the law (which was made especially stringent after the events of the great French revolution, when special legislation was enacted during the years 1799-1800), the workers created secret societies, which became numerous and active. After a hefty struggle in which the workers were assisted by the radical bourgeoisie, a struggle which took on quasi-revolutionary proportions during the years 1816, 1817, and 1819, a struggle which led the reactionary Sidmouth ministry to pass the infamous Six Acts—at last, in 1824, an Act was passed cancelling the old laws which prohibited combinations of any sort. Although this law granting the right of combination was partially repealed the very next year, the workers nevertheless gradually came to make use of the unrepealed privileges.

“Trade unions came into being in every branch of industry. They openly worked for the defence of the individual workers against the tyranny and injustice of the bourgeoisie. Their aims were: to fix wages by collective bargaining, to negotiate with the employers of labour as a power functioning in the name of all the members of the union, to regulate wages in accordance with the profits of the entrepreneur, to raise wages whenever possible, to keep wages upto the same level in every branch of work in the factories. The trade union representatives, therefore, usually negotiated with the capitalists upon the question of establishing a standard wage which should be obligatory for all employers; and should any one refuse to pay the standard rate, a strike was declared to bring him to heel. Further, by means of the limitation of the number of apprentices they endeavoured to maintain the demand for labour and thereby to keep up the level of wages. They also endeavoured to restrain the factory owner’s attempts to introduce new machinery which would lower wages. Finally, the trade unions gave help in the form of money to those of their members who were out of work.” (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 218; cf. English translation, p. 215.)

Engels was well aware that the British workers were already in his day forming unions on a national scale. “Whenever possible and advisable, the local craft associations combined to form federations; at

stated intervals these bodies were to meet in a congress to which delegates had been appointed by the unions. Not only did the unions endeavour to unite all the workers in a given trade into one great association, but from time to time (as for instance in 1830) they tried to combine the workers of the whole of England into one vast trade union, within which the workers of each craft should be independently organised." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 219; cf. English translation, pp. 215-6.)

Engels likewise describes the fighting methods of the trade unions. First of all there is the strike; then the struggle with "scab" labour, with strikebreakers, and the exercise of pressure upon non-unionists to make them toe the line.

But, while recognising that trade unionism is a necessary form of working-class organisation, Engels realises the limits of their importance in capitalist society. "The story of these associations is a tale of a long series of defeats interspersed with occasional victories. It goes without saying, that, even with all the power at its command, trade unionism is not in a position to change that economic law in accordance with which wages are regulated by demand and supply in the labour market." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 220; cf. English translation, pp. 216-7.)

But even when strikes may appear ineffectual, yet it must be clear to everybody that the workers have to protest against any wage-cut for, in the absence of such a protest the greed of the employers would know no bounds. "The unions, and the strikes which are called in their name, are important in that they are a first endeavour on the part of the workers to abolish competition among themselves. They are based on the assumption that the rule of the bourgeoisie is founded upon rivalry among the workers themselves, upon their lack of solidarity, upon the antagonism of interests between one group of workers and another." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 222; cf. English translation, pp. 218-9.)

Engels reminds those socialists and economists who condemn strikes that these activities are of educational value. "Strikes may be no more than skirmishes; sometimes they may be important engagements. They are not decisive combats, but it is abundantly clear that a final conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is impending. Strikes are the military training colleges of the workers, they are the schools wherein the proletariat is prepared for its entry into the great struggle which is inevitable; they are the proclamations whereby individual sections of the workers announce their adhesion to the labour

movement as a whole. . . . As a school in the art of war, strikes can find no equal." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 227; cf. English translation, p. 224.)

Proudhon (1809-1865) condemned strikes, and contended that they were "unconstitutional"; but Marx, emphasising Engels' conclusions and making them more definite, showed that tradeunion development was closely connected with the development of the proletariat as a class.

"Wherever and whenever the workers attempt to unite their forces, the first form such unity assumes is that of coalition. Large-scale industry assembles a mass of persons in one locality, persons who know nothing of one another. Competition disunites them. But in order to keep up wages—an interest they have in common and one which is in conflict with the interests of the boss—the workers unite to resist any attempt at a cut, they form a 'coalition.' Such a coalition has a twofold aim: to lessen competition among the workers; and to concentrate the whole strength of the workers in their combat with the capitalists. The first aim may appear to be nothing more than an endeavour to uphold the level of wages. Yet on closer inspection we find that to the degree the capitalists join forces in order to repress the workers, so the various conditions of workers tend to become groups; and, in view of the solidarity among the capitalists, the maintenance of these unified groups becomes, in the eyes of the workers who have formed them, even more important than the maintenance of the wage-level. So true is this, that, to the extreme surprise of English economists, the workers sacrifice a considerable proportion of their wages in order to provide funds for the unions which, according to these same economists, were founded only to protect wages! In the course of this struggle—a veritable civil war—all the elements of the coming battle are being united. Therewith coalitions reach the point where they assume a political character." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 136).

26. POLITICAL ORGANISATION OF THE WORKING CLASS—CHARTISM.

THE calling of strikes, the creation of trade unions, the consolidation of the unions into regional organisations, then into national organisations, and, subsequently, the endeavour to form a temporary association of several unions, progressed side by side with the political struggle of the workers, which became a serious activity after the crisis of 1836-1837.

The National Charter Association was formed in 1839, to agitate on behalf of the demands which, a year earlier, had been embodied in the People's Charter. This body, whose special aim was to alleviate the sufferings of the artisans and labouring classes, may be regarded as the first political party of the workers. Engels gives us a vivid description of how the partial struggles of separate unions and their subsequent federation into the class struggle on a national scale, were gradually transformed into a political struggle of the whole working class.

"The worker does not reverence the law, he merely submits to its enactments so long as there is no possibility of changing it. It is, therefore, perfectly natural that he should endeavour to change the law, and to replace bourgeois legislation by proletarian legislation. The English workers have thus been moved to draw up a scheme of reforms which were embodied in the People's Charter, a purely political document aiming, among other things, at the democratic reorganisation of the House of Commons. Chartism was the compact expression of working-class opposition to the bourgeoisie. In trade unions and in strikes, this conflict assumed a local and sporadic form; individual workers or sections of workers waged war against individual bourgeois. If at times the struggle became generalised, this was seldom because the workers, for their part, had consciously willed it. In so far as a deliberate widening of the scope of the movement occurred, it was the outcome of the Chartist agitation. For in Chartism, the whole working class is ranged against the bourgeoisie, attacking in the first instance the political power of the bourgeoisie, striving to make a breach in the wall of laws by which this power is encircled." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., pp. 230-1; cf. English translation, p. 227-8.)

The People's Charter was drafted in 1838 at a conference held in London between six members of the House of Commons and some representatives of the London Workingmen's Association. They petitioned for: (1) universal suffrage for all men over twenty-one years of age; (2) annual parliaments; (3) abolition of the property qualification for members of parliament; (4) vote by ballot; (5) equal electoral districts, so as to obtain a more just representation; (6) payment of members.

In his *Anti-Proudhon*, Marx describes the process whereby the working class is gradually converted into a class on its own account, the process whereby the workers develop class consciousness. Here are his very words:

"At the outset of the capitalist era, economic conditions transformed the broad masses of the population into wage workers. The dominion of capital created conditions which affected the workers as a whole, which gave them interests in common. Thus as against the capitalists they are already consolidated as a class, though they have not yet learned to look upon themselves as a class apart. In the course of the struggle. . . . the mass of the workers is consolidated so that they come to look upon themselves as a distinct class. The interests they are defending become for them class interests. But a struggle of class against class is a political struggle." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 136.)

The proletariat, as a class, as a distinctive portion of society, as a group of persons playing a specific part in the process of production, took definite shape during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. At that date, the proletariat becomes an object for scientific investigation. Its existence was so obvious that Ricardo, the greatest theoretical exponent of bourgeois political economy, considered the main task of political economy to be the elucidation of the laws which, under capitalism, regulate the distribution of commodities among three classes of society: the landed gentry, the capitalists, and the workers. Yet many years were to elapse before this class of working folk was to become a class in itself, conscious of its existence as a class apart—as a specific class having its own specific class interests, its own specific historical tasks, in a word, a class on its own account.

27. ANTAGONISMS WITHIN BOURGEOIS SOCIETY. —THE USE MADE OF THESE CONFLICTS BY THE PROLETARIAT.

DISCORD within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, strife between this and that section of the capitalist class, war between the owners of landed property and the owners of industrial property, acute rivalry between the representatives of financial interests on the one hand and manufacturing interests on the other—all these conflicts are called into being by the very composition of capitalist society.

"In the course of its historical evolution the bourgeoisie necessarily develops the antagonisms latent within it. . . . As the bourgeoisie develops, there takes place within the framework of the bourgeois order the growth of the new proletariat, a proletariat characteristic of the new times. War is engendered between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat,

a war which at first, ere it becomes felt, noticed, appraised, understood, acknowledged, and in the end loudly proclaimed by both sets of combatants, is merely transitory, manifesting itself only in partial and fugitive conflicts, in destructive activities. Yet though all members of the contemporary bourgeoisie have one and the same interest in so far as they constitute a specific class contraposed to another class, nevertheless in their relations one with another they have conflicting interests. These antagonisms arise from the economic structure of the bourgeois system." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 97.)

The history of British bourgeois society during the first half of the nineteenth century provides admirable illustration of this contention.

In 1815, immediately following the final defeat of Napoleon (1769-1821), the British landowners introduced legislation restricting the import of foreign grain, and fixing 80s. as the price at which the import of wheat was to become free of duty. This Act was intended to keep the price of wheat in the British market at about 80s. per quarter. Freed from continental competition in the corn market, the British landed interest was now guaranteed an extraordinarily high income. But the middle classes made energetic protest against the new legislation. This body of public opinion was composed of small factory owners, artisans, the petty bourgeois in general and many representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie, all of them fighting to raise their own profits. At first the agitation assumed the form of peaceful protest, but this proved hopelessly ineffective. Every petition was implacably rejected.

Even the electoral reform of the year 1832 availed nothing. All sections of the landed gentry joined forces in the fight to safeguard their incomes. The industrial bourgeoisie now decided to bring the struggle into the political arena, and to rally the "people" to the fight. In 1839, therefore, the Anti-Corn Law League was formed at Manchester, Cobden (1804-1865) and Bright (1811-1889) being the leading spirits in this organisation. The fight grew fiercer. Both factions appealed to the "lower orders" for support; there was recrimination in either camp. The industrial bourgeoisie pointed to the horrible plight of the agricultural labourers; the landed gentry retaliated by coming to the defence of the workers in industrial production, and by agitating on behalf of factory legislation.

"On the one hand, it was to the advantage of bourgeois agitators to show how little the Corn Laws protected the actual producers of corn. On the other hand, the industrial bourgeoisie was greatly incensed

because of the way in which members of the landed aristocracy were denouncing the factory system; and because of the sympathy which these utterly corrupt, heartless, and genteel loafers affected to feel for the woes of factory operatives. The advocacy of factory legislation by the landed interest was regarded by the industrial interest as the outcome of diplomatic zeal. There is an English proverb to the effect that when thieves fall out, honest men come by their own!" (*Capital*, I, 747.)

At last, on June, 29, 1846, an effectual end was put to the dispute by Peel's (1788-1850) famous Act for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The Anti-Corn Law League had won on every count. Its campaign had had the support of the workers. "The English workingmen have shown the free traders that they are not the dupes of free-trade illusions and lies. If, nevertheless, the workers rallied to the side of the free traders against the landed gentry, it was in order to wipe out the remains of feudalism and thus to have but one foe to deal with. Nor were the workers mistaken in their calculations. In the struggle over the Ten Hours Bill, the landed interests, in order to take revenge against the manufacturing interests, rallied to the support of the workers, who had been demanding this reform in vain for thirty years, while their demand was embodied in legislation immediately after the repeal of the Corn Laws." (From Marx's speech on Free Trade, delivered to the Association Democratique de Bruxelles, January 9, 1848). (See Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 186.)

Marx gives the following description of how the Ten Hours Bill was introduced. "The Corn Laws were repealed, the import duties on cotton and other raw materials were abolished, and free trade was declared to be the guiding star of legislation; in a word, the millennium was about to begin. On the other hand, in these same years, the Chartist movement and the agitation on behalf of the Ten Hours Bill attained a climax, receiving support from the Tories, who were thirsting for revenge. Despite the stubborn resistance of the foresworn free traders (with Cobden and Bright at their head) the Ten Hours Bill which had been fought for so long passed into law." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 289-90.)

The Anti-Corn Law League served the British workers as a school wherein they learned agitational methods. The League had vast sums of money at its command, and spent freely on the issuing of its newspapers, books, pamphlets, posters, and proclamations. Up to 1843, the pamphlets the League issued amounted to 10,000,000 copies. At the

head of the League there was an executive committee whose members directed the activities in the various branches of the association. Working men's, as well as working women's, organisations were intimately associated with the operations of the League. The spokesmen of the League did not fear to make an appeal to the use of force for the attainment of their ends, and expressed themselves in the plainest terms as to the wickedness of the landed gentry who wished to condemn the productive classes of the country to starvation.

Whereas in the bourgeois revolution there were plenty of aristocratic theoreticians ready to accept the view and to espouse the cause of the bourgeoisie, bourgeois theoreticians able to understand the whole course of social development and willing to adopt the proletarian outlook have been few and far between. The chief reason for this is that the gulf between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is enormously deeper and wider than the gulf between the nobility and the bourgeoisie. In the history of the Russian revolutionary movement, such theoreticians (the so-called revolutionary intelligentsia, the people who constituted the democratic parties) have seldom proved willing to join the ranks of the fighting proletariat.

28. PROLETARIAT, "PEOPLE," AND PEASANTRY —IMPORTANCE OF THE FORMS OF EXPLOITATION.

THE proletariat is differentiated from the oppressed and exploited classes, not so much in the degree to which it is exploited, as in the form the exploitation takes. Under commodity production, that is to say under capitalism (the form of commodity production in which human labour itself comes to market as a commodity), the proletariat alone struggles against the very foundations of exploitation, because the proletariat is harder hit than anyone else by commodity production. The proletarian has to live by the sale of himself, of his labour power, whereas those who belong to the other oppressed classes (petty bourgeois of every species, peasants, independent artisans) have nothing against commodity production as such, and, in so far as they form distinct classes, merely wish to remove the conditions which place their wares in an unfavourable position in the field of competition.

The fact that the proletariat is enslaved is not, therefore, the thing of prime importance. Other classes are likewise enslaved. What is of importance is the manner of the enslavement, the form it assumes; for,

by changing the form we also change the minds of the enslaved, the thoughts which are born or may be born in the brains of the enslaved. At a time when the outlook of the petty bourgeois and the peasants makes them the involuntary allies of the ruling classes, their own interests notwithstanding—when to them, just as to most other people in capitalist society, the system of private ownership seems to embody the last word in human freedom and personal independence—the outlook of the proletariat becomes ever more in harmony with its own interests. For, as the Manifesto phrases it: “Among all the classes that confront the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is really revolutionary. Other classes decay and perish with the rise of large-scale industry, but the proletariat is the most characteristic product of that industry.”

The proletariat, in the modern sense of the term, is a product of large-scale industry. It grows in numbers as large-scale industry extends. But this growth in numbers is not the only thing of importance. In earlier days, too, there were movements of the masses. What matters above all is quality, and in the proletariat we have a new kind of oppressed and subjected mass. At a time when, concomitantly with the development of capitalism, the importance of all the other classes of workers is becoming less and less, the importance of the proletariat becomes an increasingly significant factor in the general organisation of production. While the energies of the other oppressed classes are scattered, and can only be brought to bear upon numerous and widely separated parts of the social organism, the energies of the proletariat become concentrated upon a few salient points which are felt to be of vital interest to proletarians. They discard a multitude of superfluous elements of disunion, such as craft prejudices, religious zealotries, national sentiments, and the like—and can thus all the more readily combine into one great army of those who are fighting for a better future.

During the course of economic evolution, the “people”—a word so often to be heard in the mouths of the narodniks or populists and the social revolutionaries, who scorn our “narrow” Marxian phraseology—splits up into various parts, each having its own specific interests. The proletariat, on the other hand, though the members of this class are originally derived from various strata of the population, becomes, in the course of economic evolution, consolidated into a united whole made up of persons who have interests in common. Of course there are other exploited classes which are of revolutionary significance but

this revolutionary significance only arises "because they are afraid of slipping down into the ranks of the proletariat; they are not defending their present interests, but their future interests; they are forsaking their own standpoint in order to adopt that of the proletariat." Thus the class ideology of the proletariat becomes more and more the ideology of those who labour and are heavy laden; and at the head of the whole movement which aims at freeing mankind there stands, not a small group of thinkers, but the powerful army of the proletariat thoroughly conscious of its historic mission.

We need but look around to become aware of the enormous difficulty the petty bourgeoisie has in adopting the proletarian outlook. Consider the various nationalist, anti-semitic, and clericalist parties, the German Centre Party or the Italian People's Party, and you will see how hard it is for the artisans and the peasants who form the bulk of the membership to shake off the hope of improving their lot by means of increasing and strengthening their own individual property, to what a high degree of development they must attain before they can come to accept the proletarian outlook.

We have already described the way in which the modern working class comes into being, how the development of large-scale industry creates the conditions which speed-up the process of its formation as a distinct class. The dominion of capital creates for the workers a common situation and common interests. Peasant proprietors live in quite other circumstances. Marx gives an account of this, taking the French peasant as exemplar. "The peasants who farm their own small holdings form the majority of the French population. Throughout the country, they live in almost identical conditions, but enter very little into relationships one with another. Their mode of production isolates them, instead of bringing them into mutual contact. The isolation is intensified by the inadequacy of the means of communication in France, and by the poverty of the peasants. Their farms are so small that there is practically no scope for a division of labour, no opportunity for scientific agriculture. Among the peasantry, therefore, there can be no multiplicity of development, no differentiation of talents, no wealth of social relationships. Each family is almost self-sufficient, producing on its own plot of land the greater part of its requirements, and thus providing itself with the necessities of life through an interchange with nature rather than by means of intercourse with society. Here is a small plot of land, with a peasant farmer and his family; there is another plot of land, another peasant with wife

and children. A score or two of these atoms make up a village, and a few score of villages make up a department. In this way, the great mass of the French nation is formed by the simple addition of like entities, much as a sack of potatoes consists of a lot of potatoes huddled into a sack. In so far as millions of families live in economic circumstances which distinguish their mode of life, their interests, and their culture, from those of other classes, and make them more or less hostile to other classes, these peasant families form a class. But in so far as the tie between the peasants is merely one of propinquity, and in so far as the identity of their interests has failed to find expression in a community, in a national association, or in a political organisation, these peasant families do not form a class. They are, therefore, unable to assert their class interests in their own name, whether through parliament or through a congress. They cannot represent themselves, and must be represented. He who is to be their representative must also appear to them as their lord and master, as one holding authority over them, one wielding unrestricted governmental powers, who will protect them against the other classes, and who will send them the rain and the sunshine from above. Consequently, the political influence of the peasants finds its last expression in an executive which subordinates society to its own autocratic will." (Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, pp. 132-3.)

By the very conditions of its existence, the peasantry constitutes an element incompatible with the furtherance of a common policy. The movement among the peasantry which took place in England during the year 1381 under the leadership of Wat Tyler (killed in 1381), the jacqueries in France during 1358, the great peasant war of 1525 in Germany—all these so-called peasant wars acquired political significance only when the peasantry joined its forces temporarily with the movement of the towns fighting for their liberties. As one section of the population, the peasants may be said to have common interests, but this does not mean that their interests are always identical. They therefore do not rise as one man unless they are everywhere suffering from extreme poverty; and then, through the working of the extant social order, some fresh blow is dealt them, and proves the last drop in their cup of misery. Local interests continue to predominate, and, consequently, no matter how strong may be the desire to resist, the peasantry easily succumbs to the lure of so-called reforms, is easily cheated into believing in the sops that are thrown to it. The initial zeal is soon exhausted, and one village, after the other forsakes the

"common cause," contenting itself with a few petty ameliorations. Political activity, in the form of the capacity to persevere in the pursuit of an aim, has never been great among the peasants ; not even in the days of long ago, before a peasant class had been clearly differentiated from the rest of the population.

Still less were the peasants capable of effective activity when they had been subjected to the influences of a monetary economy. They became differentiated, not only within the commune, the village ; they fell apart, to form various territorial groups, each with its own specific interests. In times of revolution, the peasantry seldom plays an active part in the revolution itself. The peasant agitation only begins after the revolution has broken forth in the towns, and serves to prolong it. This was the course of events during the great French revolution ; the same thing occurred in Germany and Austria.

Bourgeois philosophers, especially on the continent of Europe, are inclined to identify the proletariat with the whole of that group of persons which Marx christened "Lumpenproletariat" (slum or tatterdermalen proletariat). For these gentry, every proletarian is a "pauper," is "indigent," is a "vagrant," etc. In his polemic against Stirner (one of the teachers of Bakunin), Marx shows that "pauperism is a condition in which only the ruined proletarian finds himself, the lowest rung to which can fall the proletarian who has lost his powers of resistance to bourgeois pressure. Only a proletarian who has been completely drained of his energy thus becomes a pauper." (Marx, *Der heilige Max* [Stirner], Bernstein's *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, Vol. III, p. 175.)

In *Capital*, where Marx is analysing the various forms of relative surplus population under capitalist production, he tells us that the dregs of the relative surplus population dwell in the world of pauperism. (*Capital*, I, 711.) The slum proletariat, in whose ranks he includes vagrants, criminals, prostitutes, and other persons dangerous to society, he places in a category apart. Pauperism, he says (p. 712), "is the infirmary of the active labour army, and the dead weight which has to be carried by the industrial reserve army." These rejects from industrial production accumulate in the great towns, become apaches, hooligans, roughs, etc., play no part in the productive process, are ever ready to sell themselves to the reaction and thus to swell the ranks of the black hundreds or of the fascists.

In *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, a book wherein Marx achieves a

brilliant historical analysis of the circumstances which enabled Napoleon III (1808-1873) to carry out his coup d'état, we are shown the important part played by the slum proletariat of Paris in the successful issue of this revolution which consolidated the power of the bourgeoisie under the third Napoleon. The Society of December the Tenth dated from the year 1849. "Under the pretext of founding a charitable institution, the Parisian slum proletariat had been organised in secret sections. Each section was under the leadership of Bonapartist agents, and the whole concern was commanded by a Bonapartist general. Side by side with broken-down profligates of uncertain means of livelihood and questionable antecedents, side by side with decayed adventurers who had dropped out of the ranks of the bourgeoisie, there were vagabonds, disbanded soldiers, discharged prisoners, fugitives from the galleys, sharpers, jugglers, professional beggars, pickpockets, conjurors, gamesters, pimps, brothel-keepers, porters, men of letters, organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife-grinders, tinkers—in a word, all the elements of that vague, dissolute, down-at-heels and out-at-elbows rabble which the French denote by the composite name of *la Bohème*. They were kindred elements to Louis Bonaparte, and it was of them that he formed the substantial framework of his Society of December the Tenth." (Marx, *Eighteenth Brumaire*, p. 83.)

29. THE PROLETARIAT AND RESPECT FOR LAW

PRIVATE property lies at the root of all capitalist society. In the name of justice and equality, the bourgeoisie freed it from the trammels of feudalism, from monopoly and from privilege. Owing to the laws of capitalist development, this private property pure and simple gradually became transformed into capitalist private property, that is to say it became a kind of property whose existence depended upon an increasing number of persons being deprived of their private property. The more fuss the bourgeois make over the sacredness and inviolability of private property, the more eagerly do they take it away from the small trader, the artisan, and the peasant, thereby changing these into folk lacking private property, *i.e.*, into proletarians. By demanding the destruction of private property, the proletariat is merely asking for the destruction of something which has been destroyed so far as they themselves are concerned—something the lack of which is their essential characteristic. The proletariat is the mass of persons arising out of the break-up of the old order, out of the decay of the middle classes,

and above all, the lower strata of the middle classes. In his first formulation of his new conception of the historical role of the proletariat, Marx writes (*Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie*, in *Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. I, p. 620.) "If the proletariat heralds the dissolution of the pre-existent order of society, it is merely expressing the mystery of its own existence, seeing that it is itself in actual fact the dissolution of that order. If the proletariat demands the negation of private property, it is merely elevating to become a principle of society that which society has already made its own principle, that which in the proletariat itself, without its own co-operation, has already been incorporated as a negative outcome of society."

The laws for protecting private property were begotten by the capitalist system. It became ever clearer in the course of capitalist development that these laws were incapable of defending property, be they never so carefully elaborated. So far as the workers are concerned, such laws exist merely to prevent their making an attack on private property. Only by a stubborn fight and by the sacrifice of many victims has the proletariat achieved a certain amount of legal protection for its own, its only, property, namely its labour power; only through constant struggle on the part of the workers have laws been passed to safeguard this labour power from the ruthless exploitation of the capitalists. In his book dealing with the condition of the working class in England, Engels gives us an admirable picture of the attitude of the workers towards these bourgeois laws, their loss of respect for these same laws, and so on.

"The law is of course sacred in the eyes of the bourgeoisie, for it was concocted by the bourgeoisie, was passed with the approval of the bourgeoisie, and exists for the benefit and the safeguarding of the bourgeois social order. The bourgeoisie knows full well that, even if one specific law should be injurious to the individual bourgeois, the code as a whole protects the interests of the bourgeois class as a whole. Nay more. The sacredness of the law, the inviolability of established institutions which have been set up by the active will of one section of society and are passively accepted by another section of society—these abstractions constitute the most solid buttress of the bourgeois' position in society. To the English bourgeois the law is sacred, for he sees in it his own image and likeness, just as he sees his own image and likeness in God. That is why the policeman's truncheon (which is really his own truncheon) has so comforting an effect on his mind! But the worker fails to see this sacredness. Experience has taught

him only too implacably that the law is a scourge of cords, which the bourgeoisie has plaited for him. Consequently, unless circumstances compel, the worker never appeals to the law. . . .” Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 230; cf. Quelch’s translation, p. 227.) “What adequate reason has the proletarian for refraining from theft? No doubt the phrase ‘sacredness of property’ is a pretty one, and sounds pleasant to the bourgeois ear, but you can hardly expect property to be sacred to one who has no property at all. Money is the god of this world. The bourgeois deprives the proletarian of money, and thus makes him for practical purposes an atheist. Can we be surprised that the proletarian avows his atheism, loses all respect for the sacredness and the power of the god of this world? When the poverty of the proletarian is intensified to the pitch of absolute want of the elementary necessities of life, when hunger and destitution act as spurs, the stimuli towards disregarding the canons of the existing social order are likewise intensified.” (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 118; cf. English translation, p. 115.)

The whole psychology of the worker is changed under the influence of the conditions created during the course of the evolution of large-scale industry and the consequent concentration of large masses of the population in the towns. By uniting, be it never so superficially, among themselves for a common aim, the workers begin to look upon themselves as a class, they begin to notice that while acting apart from one another they are weak but that if they act together they acquire strength; they become acutely aware of their differentiation from the bourgeoisie; they begin to think their own thoughts, to have their own points of view, to make these thoughts and outlooks conform to their own position as workers; they come to realise their slave status, and gradually evolve a knowledge of political and social happenings. Under the old patriarchal relationships, the enslavement of the worker was cunningly veiled; spiritually speaking, the worker was no more than a corpse, totally unaware of his own interests and lacking any general knowledge. Only when the master had become a stranger, only when it was patent to all men’s eyes that the sole tie between master and man was the master’s personal interest in extracting profit out of the relationship, only when all sympathy had disappeared leaving not a trace behind—did the worker begin to become conscious of his position and of his own personal interests, only then did he begin to relive spiritually speaking, and only then did he cease to be the slave of the master in the realms of feeling and thought and endeavour.

The bourgeoisie has more in common with the backward nations of the earth than with the workers living in their midst. The workers speak a different tongue, they have antagonistic ideas and conjectures, different habits and moral principles, different religious and political outlooks, from any accepted by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are two distinct nations, so utterly different from one another that we may say they constitute two races. Disraeli's novel, *Sybil, or the Two Nations*, was written in 1845, contemporaneously with the genesis of Engels' book on the conditions of the English working class, and less than three years before the appearance of the *Communist Manifesto*. Disraeli used the old terminology, and told his readers that the "two nations" were "the rich" and "the poor" (see Note no. 49). But to-day we can see clearly enough that the young conservative statesman had been powerfully impressed by the widening gulf, both mental and physical, between bourgeoisie and proletariat.

30. EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION—INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE PROLETARIAN MOVEMENT

"THE existence of an oppressed class is essential to any society based upon class antagonisms. The emancipation of the oppressed class therefore implies the creation of a new society. If the oppressed class is to achieve its liberation, it is necessary that the extant forces of production and the prevailing social relations should no longer be compatible with one another. Among the instruments of production, the revolutionary class is itself the mightiest of productive forces. The organisation of the revolutionary elements to form a single class presupposes that all the productive forces it were possible to engender within the framework of the old society have in very fact been engendered. Are we, therefore, to run away with the idea that after the overthrow of the erstwhile society another class dominion will be set up? That this new dominion will culminate in a new political power? Certainly not. The essential condition for the emancipation of the working class is that all class shall be done away with. We have an exact parallel in earlier history, when the essential condition for the emancipation of the third estate, *ie.*, of the bourgeois order, was the abolition of all the estates of the realm, of all the various orders." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 137.)

In a later note (42) I propose to deal further with the question

of the international character of the proletarian movement. Here I need merely remind the reader that the authors of the Manifesto made use of the word "national" in a governmental and territorial sense. When they speak of the class struggle as "primarily national," they mean that the fight takes place within the boundaries of a national State, such as France, England, Belgium, etc. In order to get the better of the international bourgeoisie, it is necessary that the proletariat should fight on the international scale, rallying the proletariat of other lands to act as allies in the struggle. But before it can do this it has to deal with the bourgeoisie of its own country first. The Second International came to grief because its leaders, by adopting the slogan "Defence of the Fatherland," committed themselves to starting by the destruction of foreign bourgeoisies, this involving the slaughter, not only of their proletarian brothers across the frontier, but also of their own proletarian co-nationals. Never, not even in the fiercest of civil wars, in a period of revolution, in an epoch of the most fanatical strife between the nations, never before in the whole course of history, has so much blood been shed, have so many lives been lost, as in the recent world war, which had the blessing of those very persons who turn away with horror from the thought of a forcible overthrow of bourgeois dominion in their own land—because, forsooth, this may involve bloodshed!

"In the course of its development the working class will replace the old bourgeois society by an association which will know nothing of classes and class antagonisms. Then there will no longer be a political power in the usual sense of the term, for political power is merely the official expression of the antagonisms which prevail in bourgeois society. But until that day, the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a struggle between two distinct classes; it is a struggle which, carried to its term, constitutes a revolution. Need we be surprised to find that a society which is founded upon class antagonisms will ultimately come to a clash of arms, will be disintegrated by a hand-to-hand struggle? Do not assert that the social movement excludes the political movement. There has never yet been a political movement which was not simultaneously a social movement. Only after the establishment of a system in which classes and class antagonisms no longer exist, will social evolutions cease to be political revolutions. But until then, every time a general overhauling of society is about to take place, the last word of social science will be, to quote

George Sand [1804-1876], 'War or death; a bloody fight, or extinction. such is the unavoidable alternative!'" (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 137-38.)

31. CAPITALIST ACCUMULATION LEADS TO THE IMPOVERISHMENT AND DEGRADATION OF THE WORKING CLASS—EXPROPRIATION OF THE EXPROPRIATORS

EVEN when the worker succeeds in selling his labour power to the best advantage, even when he receives the maximum wage, he still remains subject to the perturbations caused by industrial cycles, he is still liable to be the victim of a crisis. The insecurity of his existence, the rise and fall of wages, the perpetual menace of unemployment, all these things make the proletarian's situation an utterly different one from that of the slave or the serf. "The proletarian, who has nothing but his two hands, who consumes to-day what he earned yesterday, who is dependent upon every hazard, who has not the slightest guarantee that he shall be able to earn enough to satisfy his barest needs, who may be deprived of his daily bread by a trade crisis or through the whims of his employer—the proletarian is placed in a most deplorable position, in a position so inhuman that no worse can be conceived for any man. The slave is at least assured a livelihood, for otherwise he would be of no use to his master; the serf is at least provided with a scrap of land on which to grow food for his maintenance; both slave and serf are thus guaranteed a bare subsistence. The proletarian, however, has to rely upon himself alone. And yet he is in such a position that he can never be sure of being able to earn a livelihood. Improve his position as he may, all he can do is but a drop when compared with the ocean of unhappy chances to which he is exposed." (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 119; cf. English translation, p. 116.)

The development of large-scale industry aggravates the insecurity of the worker's position, and, with the speeding-up of the process of the accumulation of capital, it creates the industrial reserve army of labour, which exercises continuous pressure upon the active army of workers, and does not permit those employed in the factories to get their wages raised to any appreciable extent. A typical result of the life-cycle of modern industry—a cycle in which a medium intensity of production is followed by a boom, and this by a crisis, a slump, and a period of stagnation—is that it leads to the growth of surplus

population and to fluctuations in the size of the industrial reserve army. The larger the reserve army, the greater the risk that the workers will be forced down into the ranks of the paupers; this process, indeed, may go so far that society is compelled to feed them and shelter them in workhouses, or to give them some form of outdoor relief.

"The result is that, in proportion as capital accumulates, the condition of the worker, be his wages high or low, necessarily grows worse. Finally, the law in accordance with which the relative surplus population, or the industrial reserve army, always balances the scope and the energy of accumulation, chains the worker to capital even more effectually than Prometheus was fastened to the rock by the fetters forged by Hephaestus. Thanks to the working of this law, poverty grows as the accumulation of capital grows. The accumulation of wealth at one pole of society involves a simultaneous accumulation of poverty, labour torment, slavery, ignorance, brutalisation, and moral degradation, at the opposite pole—where dwells the class that produces its own product in the form of capital." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 714.)

The final paragraph of the first section of the Manifesto, with its prophetic vision of the fate of capitalist society, is repeated and elaborated in the first volume of *Capital* after two decades of further experience and profounder analysis. Here we read in the penultimate chapter:

"As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently disintegrated the old society, has decomposed it through and through; as soon as the workers have been metamorphosed into proletarians, and their means of labour into capital; as soon as the capitalist method of production can stand upon its own feet—then the further socialisation of labour and the further transformation of the land and of the other means of production into socially utilised (that is to say, communal) means of production, which implies the further expropriation of private owners, takes on a new form. What has now to be expropriated, is no longer the labourer working on his own account, but the capitalist who exploits many labourers. This expropriation is brought about by the operation of the immanent laws of capitalist production, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist lays a number of his fellow capitalists low. Hand in hand with such centralisation, concomitantly with the expropriation of many capitalists by a few, the co-operative form of the labour process develops to an ever increasing degree; therewith we find a growing tendency towards the purposive application of science

to the improvement of technique; the land is more methodically cultivated; the instruments of labour tend to assume forms which are only utilisable by combined effort; the means of production are economised through being turned to account only by joint, by social labour; all the peoples of the world are enmeshed in the net of the world market, and therefore the capitalist regime tends more and more to assume an international character. While there is thus a progressive diminution in the number of the capitalist magnates (who usurp and monopolise all the advantages of this transformative process), there occurs a corresponding increase in the mass of poverty, oppression, enslavement, degeneration, and exploitation; but at the same time there is a steady intensification of the wrath of the working class—a class which grows ever more numerous, and is disciplined, unified, and organised by the very mechanism of the capitalist method of production. Capitalist monopoly becomes a fetter upon the method of production which has flourished with it and under it. The centralisation of the means of production and the socialisation of labour reach a point where they prove incompatible with their capitalist husk. This bursts asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated!" (Marx, *Capital*, I, 845-846.)

II.

PROLETARIANS AND COMMUNISTS

32. COMMUNISTS AND THE WORKING-CLASS PARTIES

THE words "communists do not form a separate party conflicting with other working-class parties" might, at the present moment, give rise to misunderstanding. They might mean, and some have erroneously supposed them to mean, that Marx and Engels were antagonistic on principle to the creation of a separate communist party. These words must, however, be interpreted in the light of the historical circumstances in which the Communist League came into being. As far as the organisation of workers into parties on a national scale is concerned, there was at that time only one such party, the Chartists in England. In France, apart from the social democrats under the leadership of Ledru-Rollin and Flocon, there was nothing more than a group here and there that had been linked up with the old Barbes (1809-1870) and Blanquist organisation which had come to grief during the defeats of 1839. In addition there were some "circles" of "materialist com-

munists" and "working-class equalitarians." Although these groups and circles, in contrast with the petty-bourgeois party of social democrats, were almost wholly composed of proletarians, nevertheless, prior to the year 1848, they did not become anything more than groups or circles, and were not in any sense of the term a nation-wide organisation. Matters were no better in Switzerland, or in Belgium and Germany.

But the Communist League, from the very outset, was formed as an international organisation, and was obliged to order its relations towards its national sections in such a way as to avoid unnecessary overlapping between these and any national parties that might exist. Such precautions were especially required in the case of England, where Chartism had become, above all, the political organisation of the working class. The English communists, among whom we may mention George Julian Harney (1817-1899) and Ernest Jones (1819-1869), did not found a new party. They merely endeavoured to fuse Chartism and communism, to play the part of advance guard, and to place in the forefront of their discussion the question of property.

The formulation of the tasks to be undertaken by communists is to be found in the Manifesto. In so far as we are concerned with the relations between the Communist Party and the working class, this formulation still holds good to-day. The program of the Russian Communist Party is in complete harmony with it, as we see from the following extract:

"Determining to make the proletariat capable of fulfilling its great historic mission, the international Communist Party organises the proletariat into an independent political party, opposed to all the bourgeois parties; leads the workers in all the manifestations of the class struggle; reveals to the exploited the irreconcilable conflict of interests between themselves and the exploiters; and explains to the proletariat the historical significance and the necessary conditions of the imminent social revolution." (*A B C of Communism*, by Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, p. 375.)

33. FEUDALIST PROPERTY AND BOURGEOIS PROPERTY

"In every historical epoch, property has assumed different forms and has developed under different social relations. Therefore, in order to give a definition of what bourgeois property is, we need do no more

than describe all the social relations of capitalist production. An endeavour to define property as independent of prevailing conditions, as a category apart, as an abstract and everlasting idea, marks you out as the victim of metaphysical or legalist illusions." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 121.)

The question of property assumes different forms which correspond to the various phases of industrial development in general and to the peculiarities which attach to the growth of industry in various lands.

"During the epoch of the English revolution, and likewise during the French revolution, the question of property was one which implied the creation of such conditions as would facilitate free competition and the abolition of all those feudal property relations (feudal privileges, guilds, monopolies, etc.) which were so many fetters upon the development of industry from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Together with the various degrees of industrial development, the question of property is always a vital one for some particular class. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when feudal property relations had to be abolished, the property question was a vital one for the bourgeoisie. In the nineteenth century, when the problem consists in the destruction of bourgeois property relations, the property question becomes a vital one for the proletariat."

The bourgeoisie destroyed all the old economic forms, and therewith all the property relations appertaining to those forms. In addition, the political organisation which was the official expression of the old order was likewise abolished. In place of the feudal form of property, the bourgeoisie installed its own form of property. Justice and equality were the foundations upon which the bourgeoisie wished to build a new social edifice, constructing it out of the fragments of the feudal property relations. All the members of bourgeois society were to be free and equal, all of them owners, producing commodities to be exchanged for other commodities, belonging to these equal and free proprietors, who would never seek to get more than a just price. And yet in actual fact the bourgeoisie has founded a society based on privilege, inequality, injustice; a society wherein conflicts and antagonisms are even more acute than they were in the feudal era.

"Day by day it becomes increasingly clear that the relations of production within which the bourgeoisie lives and has its being are not unique in form, are not simple in character. On the contrary, they assume a twofold aspect. The relations which create wealth likewise

lead to the production of poverty; the relations which promote the development of productive power, likewise create the power of oppression; the relations which create bourgeois wealth, *i.e.*, the wealth of the bourgeois class, only create that wealth by depriving other members of the bourgeois class of their wealth and by the creation of an ever-growing proletariat." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 97).

Marx shows us the manner in which, under the conditions of commodity production and circulation, the law of appropriation or the law of private property "is transformed by means of its own inner and inexorable dialectic into its direct opposite." (*Capital*, I, 641.) Once the commodity labour power appears in the market, it becomes possible for the capitalists, as owners of the means of production, systematically, but in strict accordance with the law and without any infringement of the rights of property, to deprive certain other commodity owners, the wage workers, of part of the products which these have made. "The relation of exchange between capitalist and worker thus becomes a mere semblance appertaining to the process of circulation, a mere form foreign to the essence of the transaction and serving only as a mystification thereof. The perpetual buying and selling of labour power is the outward form. The essential content is that the capitalist again and again appropriates, without equivalent, a portion of the previously materialised labour of others, and exchanges it for a greater quantity of living labour Nowadays property appears to mean, as far as the capitalist is concerned, the right to appropriate others' unpaid labour, or the product thereof; and, as far as the worker is concerned, the impossibility of appropriating the product of his own labour. The divorce between property and labour has become the necessary consequence of a law which ostensibly originated in their identity." Marx, *Capital*, I, 641-642.)

In other words: "The primary transformation of money into capital takes place in perfect harmony with the economic laws of commodity production and with the right of property deduced from these laws. Nevertheless, it has as its outcome:

"1. That the product belongs to the capitalist and not to the worker.

"2. That the value of this product includes, in addition to the value of the capital advanced, a surplus value, which has cost the worker his work, but has cost the capitalist nothing at all, and is none the less the legitimate property of the capitalist.

"3. That the worker's labour power continues intact, and is still at his disposal to sell, if he can find a purchaser." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 643.)

Meanwhile, what is called the right of property persists in the capitalist method of production, though the effect has become very different from what it was in precapitalist days. "This same right remains in force, no matter whether things be as they were in the early days, when the product belonged to the producer, and when the latter, exchanging equivalent for equivalent, could enrich himself in no other way than by his own labour; or whether things be as they are in the capitalist period, when, to an ever increasing extent, social wealth becomes the property of those who are in a position that enables them, again and again, to appropriate the unpaid labour of others." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 645.)

Until private property is abolished its effects will persist, and the working class will be exploited by the capitalist class. For this reason, the whole theory of communism may be summed up in the words: Abolish private ownership of the means of production, and establish communal ownership. It must not be concluded from this that the communists are the foes of all kinds of private property, that they are out to abolish every sort of private property. Private property exists in various shapes; in fact, there is private property and private property!

"Private property, as contrasted with social or collective property, exists only where the means of labour and the external conditions of labour belong to private individuals. But the character of private property differs according as the private individuals are workers or non-workers. The innumerable shades which, at the first glance, seem to be exhibited by private property, are merely reflexions of the intermediate conditions that lie between these two extremes. The worker's ownership of the means of production is the basis of petty industry; and petty industry is an indispensable condition for the development of social production and of the free individuality of the worker. Of course this method of production is also found within the shareholding system, within the system of serfdom, and within other dependent relationships. But it only flourishes, only manifests its full energy, only assumes its adequate and classical form where the worker is the free private owner of the means of labour which he uses; only when the peasant owns the land he tills, and when the handi-

craftsman owns the tools which he handles as a virtuoso." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 844.) Such private property as this is acquired by your own labour. Nevertheless, at a certain stage of social evolution it is superseded by the capitalist form of private property which is based on the exploitation of another's labour—though in point of form that labour is "free."

For these reasons, therefore, although the communists are fighting for the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, they take up a totally different attitude towards the other form of private property outlined above. Towards one who owns private property which has been acquired by personal labour, the communists adopt a friendly method of approach. They try to show him that the situation of the small producer is a hopeless one so long as commodity production prevails, and that private property is at present a means of exploiting him. But towards the owners of capitalist private property, the communists adopt a completely different attitude. They wage ruthless warfare against them, and endeavour to hasten the hour of their death as a class. The crowning act of the social revolution is not the expropriation of the expropriated, but the expropriation of the expropriators; not the expropriation of private ownership based on personal labour, but the expropriation of capitalist private property.

34. CAPITAL IS THE OUTCOME OF A SPECIFIC, AND TRANSIENT, PHASE OF SOCIAL EVOLUTION

BOURGEOIS economists look upon capital as a perennial condition of social production, as perennially indispensable to the productivity of labour. They forget that it is only under certain historical conditions that the means of production are changed into capital, and the man who labours is transformed into a wage worker, a proletarian.

"Capital presupposes wage labour, and wage labour presupposes capital. They depend on one another, and create one another. Does a worker in a cotton factory merely produce cotton goods? No, he produces capital. He produces values which thereupon, anew, hold sway over his labour, using it for the creation of more values, and so on. Capital can increase only in so far as it is exchanged for labour power, only by summoning wage labour into existence. The labour power of the wage worker can be exchanged for capital only in so far

as it thereby increases capital, strengthens the very power to which it is enslaved. By increasing capital, the proletariat automatically increases its own numbers, the numbers of those who form the working class." (Marx, *Lohnarbeit und Kapital*, pp. 27-8; *Wage-Labour and Capital*, p. 19.)

Outside of certain determined social relations, outside of society at this or that stage of historical development, the means of production cannot constitute capital. This is the power, not of one individual, but of society.

"A negro is a negro. He becomes a slave only under certain conditions. A cotton-spinning machine is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain conditions does it become capital. Apart from those conditions it is no more capital than gold in itself is money, or sugar the price of sugar. . . . Capital, too, is a social relation of production, and a bourgeois relation at that. It is a relation of production peculiar to bourgeois society. The means of subsistence, the instruments of labour, the raw materials, all these essential components of capital, are they not produced and stored up under special social conditions, under certain social relations? Are they not used, under these special social conditions and relations, for the purpose of further production? And is it not precisely this social character which transforms into capital the products serving for fresh production?" (Marx, *Lohnarbeit und Kapital*, pp. 24-5; *Wage-Labour and Capital*, pp. 15-16.)

But this social power is a private power, the property of a private individual, personified in the capitalist, giving him the uncontrolled right to dispose of it as he likes. The quicker the growth of the capitalist means of production, the more fully the various branches of industry are developed the more rapid the extinction of small undertakings—the more acute becomes the contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation. We need but withdraw from the social means of production their capitalist character, and they become social property. "The proletariat seizes the State power and straightway transforms the means of production into State property." (Engels, *Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, p. 48; *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, p. 86.) Thereby he liberates the forces of production from the capitalist grip and opens the way for the full and free development of their social character.

This makes it possible to carry on social production in accordance with a preconcerted plan. The development of production has now made the existence of different classes an anachronism.

35. PRIVATE AND INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY—THE PRINCIPLE OF DISTRIBUTION IN A COMMUNIST SOCIETY

WE have already seen how the capitalist method of appropriation creates private capitalist property which is utterly different from individual private property based on the work of the owner himself. We have seen, further, that the only property which the communists want to expropriate is capitalist private property. By leaving the property of the small producers in the hands of these workers, so long as such property is not used as a means for the exploitation of others, the communists maintain the personal property of every member of society: they do not put an end to the personal appropriation of products necessary to the maintenance of life. Yet, in order to deprive such appropriation of the evil characteristics it has hitherto possessed, communists base this individual property upon the acquisitions of the capitalist era, that is to say upon the co-operation of free workers, and upon their joint ownership of the means of production, including the land.

The form this personal, this individual property will assume, the principles upon which will be based the distribution of the social product among the various workers, will depend upon the historical conditions of the time, upon the degree of development which the productive forces of society have attained at the moment when the proletariat marches forward to the seizure of political power. After various deductions have been made from the social product (deductions necessary in order to keep the social process of production going along normal lines) for the replacement and repair of the means of production, for the creation of a reserve fund, for general expenditure on administrative purposes, for the satisfaction of social and cultural needs, for the care of the disabled—the balance of the social product will be distributed among the producers. During the period of transition from the old order to the new, when vestiges of the old society still cling to the new, each producer will receive a share of the products strictly proportioned to the amount of his labour; but, even when class distinctions have been done away with, there will remain the natural privileges

attaching to the possession of individual talent, and the reward for labour will be regulated according to quality, quantity, and intensity.

Only when communist society has reached a high stage of development, "when the slavish subordination of the individual to the yoke of the division of labour has disappeared, and when concomitantly the distinction between mental and physical work has ceased to exist; when labour is no longer the means to live, but is in itself the first of vital needs; when the productive forces of society have expanded proportionally with the multiform development of the individuals of whom society is made up—then will the narrow bourgeois outlook be utterly transcended, and then will society inscribe upon its banner: 'From every one according to his capacities, to every one according to his needs.'" (Marx, *The Socialist Program* [Gotha Program], p. 9, col. 1.)

36. THE DOMINION OF CAPITAL OVER LABOUR

CAPITAL, according to bourgeois economists, is stored labour serving as a means for fresh production. They come to this conclusion because they look upon capital as an assemblage of raw materials, instruments of labour, and supplies for the maintenance of life, the whole being essential to the continuance of production. But all these constituent parts of capital are commodities, that is to say they are products that are already endowed with a definitely social character, which they assume only after economic relations have reached a certain stage of development. Thus capital is not merely a sum of material products; it is an assemblage of products which are commodities, which are exchange-values, which are objects having a social significance. Every sum of commodities is such a sum of exchange-values. How is its conversion into capital effected?

"How is a quantity of commodities, of exchange-values transformed into capital? In this way. As an independent social power (*i.e.*, as the power of a part of society), it maintains itself and increases itself through exchange for living labour power. The existence of a class of persons who own nothing except their capacity for labour is an indispensable prerequisite to the existence of capital. Only the rule of stored-up, past, materialised labour over living labour, transforms stored-up labour into capital. Capital does not consist in this, that stored-up labour serves living labour as a means for fresh production. It consists in this, that living labour serves stored-up labour as a means for maintaining and increasing its exchange-value." (Marx,

Lohnarbeit und Kapital, pp. 26-27; *Wage-Labour and Capital*, pp. 17-18.) In *Capital*, Marx gives an even clearer exposition of the way in which stored-up, dead labour rules living labour, in which past labour rules present labour:

"All kinds of capitalist production, in so far as they are not merely labour processes, but also processes for promoting the self-expansion of capital, have this in common, that in them the worker does not use the instruments of labour, but the instruments of labour use the worker. However, it is only in machine production that this inversion acquires a technical and palpable reality. Through its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour comes to confront the worker during the labour process as capital, as dead labour, which controls the living labour and sucks it dry." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 455-6.)

The system of society in which the great majority of the population is obliged to sell itself for a paltry wage, is described by bourgeois economists as a "free" regime.

"Do not let yourselves be deceived by that abstraction 'freedom,'" exclaimed Marx in the speech on free trade from which I have already quoted. "Whose freedom? The word does not betoken the freedom of one person in relation to another. It betokens merely freedom for capital to oppress the worker. Why should people try to find a warrant for 'free' competition by invoking the sanction of this idea of freedom, seeing that the idea of freedom is itself only the product of a state of affairs based on free competition?" (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, P. 193.)

37. BOURGEOIS PERSONALITY AND HUMAN PERSONALITY

In Marx's polemic against Max Stirner, there are several interesting observations concerning the relationship between the bourgeois individual and the human individual. Bourgeois thinkers like Destutt de Tracy, the French philosopher (1754-1836), look upon property as something inseparable from the human individual, linked up with him by natural bonds. For them, property, individuality, personality, are all one and the same thing. The concept "I" includes within itself the concept "my."

"Nature endowed man with an inalienable and inseparable property, i.e., individuality. . . . Property exists, if not in every place where a sentient individual exists, at least wherever an individual with

a will exists." (Destutt de Tracy, quoted by Marx, *Der heilige Max* [Stirner], Bernstein's *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, Vol. III, p. 361.) Stirner himself was not far from this same outlook.

"If," writes Marx, "the narrow-minded bourgeois, turning to the communist, exclaims: 'By abolishing property, which is tantamount to depriving me of my existence as a capitalist, a landed proprietor, or a factory owner, and to depriving you of your own existence as a worker, you abolish my individuality and your own individuality; by making it impossible for me to exploit you as workers, impossible to gather in profit, dividends, and rent, you make it impossible for me to exist as an individual.' If the bourgeois thus says to the communist: 'By destroying my existence as a bourgeois, you destroy my existence as an individual,' if he thus identifies his status as a bourgeois with his individuality, then, we can at any rate commend him for his frankness, not to say his shamelessness! As far as the bourgeois is concerned, this is actually the state of affairs, for he imagines that he is an individual only in so far as he is a bourgeois. But as soon as the theoreticians of the bourgeoisie intervene, proceeding as a matter of general theory to identify bourgeois property with individuality, and seeking to justify this identification by means of logic, then only does sheer nonsense become consecrated and sanctified. . . . It is all the easier for a bourgeois to use his own vernacular to prove that mercantile relations are identical with individual relations and even with human relations in general, seeing that this vernacular is itself a bourgeois product, and therefore in the concrete world as well as in the world of language huckstering has been made the pivot on which everything turns." (Marx on Stirner, *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, Vol. III, pp. 362-363.)

While the communists wish to destroy private property alone, so that it shall lose every trait which has characterised it as individually acquired property, bourgeois thinkers (among whom it behoves us to place such ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie as Proudhon and Stirner, the most radical spokesmen of this class) endeavour at every turn to twist this to mean the destruction of property in general. Stirner does so with characteristically perverse ingenuity.

Only *private* property (which must be clearly differentiated from *individual* or *personal* property, such as "my" shirt, "my" coat—property which does not give its possessor the power of controlling even the most insignificant amount of others' labour), only *exploitative* property, creates the conditions whereby social power can be monopolised, whereby

the "owners" can turn to their exclusive advantage the natural and individual qualities, not only of persons but also of things.

"As far as the owner of land is concerned, his only interest in the soil is the rent he can extract from it. But rent is a quality of the land which it can lose without losing a single one of its inalienable qualities, without losing a jot of its fertility. Thus rent is a quality the amount and even the existence of which depends upon social relations created or destroyed without any intervention on the part of the individual land-owner. The same may be said of the machine. Money (that most generalised form of property) has very little to do with personal characteristics, and may even be directly opposed to them. Shakespeare knew this very much better than our petty-bourgeois theorists when he wrote (*Timon of Athens*, Act IV, Sc. 3.):

Gold? yellow, glittering, precious gold? . . .

Thus much of this will make black, white; foul, fair;

Wrong, right; base, noble; old, young; coward, valiant. In a word, landrent, profit, and all the other economic essentials of private property, are *social relations* corresponding to a particular phase of production. They are 'individual' only so long as they have not yet become fetters upon the extant forces of production." (Marx on Stirner, *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, Vol. III, p. 363.)

38. BOURGEOIS LOVE OF WORK AND PROLETARIAN SLOTH

At one time it was said that were slavery or serfdom to be done away with, the sometime slaves or serfs would be loth to do any work and that they would give themselves up to idleness. Without whips or the rod, the "gross laziness of the common people" could not be overcome. In reality these contentions have proved completely false. Free labour has been more productive than unfree. But this "free" labour is performed by a free worker whose freedom resembles that of a bird on the wing. The bird is "free" to go on flying, or to cease flying—and fall! The worker is likewise "free" from all ownership of the means of production, and is therefore obliged to sell himself, to sell his labour power. In place of the lash or the rod, he is goaded into the capitalist factory by the pangs of bitter need. He works under constant, for, instead of the sometime overseer, he now has the foreman's eye for ever upon him, and the boss's code of laws to punish him if he slacks. As a result of

the division of labour (the evil consequences of which, far from diminishing as machinofacture progresses, grow with the growth of machine production), the labour of the worker is to a certain extent deprived of content, of meaning. Communists demand the creation of such conditions as shall guarantee that the labour of the worker shall indeed be a "free activity," shall give free rein to the worker's spiritual and physical powers, and shall not be excessively arduous or monotonous toil. The bourgeois answer to this demand is a modern version of the refrain about the "gross laziness of the common people."

When the proletariat assumes power, it will be faced (is faced, here in Russia) by a complicated series of tasks. The revolution itself causes a certain amount of disorder in the process of production. Time is needed before internal peace is restored. A fall in the supply of finished commodities is unavoidable during the period of transition. Such a decline is inevitable even in the most favourable conditions, when the proletariat is successful in reorganising industrial enterprises satisfactorily. But when it proves impossible either to supply the factories with the necessary means of production or the workers with the means of subsistence, when tools are worn out, when the workers' strength is exhausted, when the supply of raw materials is at an end, then the tasks facing the proletariat are formidable indeed.

While imposing the obligation to labour upon all citizens, the proletariat has at the same time to avoid any action which would be reminiscent of work carried on in prison or barracks. In order to strengthen the self-discipline of the workers, to spread the idea of such conscious discipline far and wide, to show how such discipline is essential in view of the social character of the instruments of labour, and to prove that such discipline is obligatory upon a society so recently emerging out of the capitalist husk and still bearing traces of its former envelope, still burdened by remnants of the capitalist system—in order to do all this, it is necessary in the early days of a communist society to have recourse to various devices which shall stimulate and heighten the impulse to work. In addition to the measures introduced with a view to improving the conditions of labour and to making labour more attractive, the proletarian government will have to encourage diligence by giving special rewards for well-performed work. But such measures must, from the very outset, be introduced, not with the object of setting apart the most efficient workers and holding them up in an invidious way as models for all the remaining workers, but, rather with the object of increasing the

output of the collectivity of workers to which each individual worker belongs.

39. MATERIAL PRODUCTION AND MENTAL PRODUCTION

The production and distribution of the products of mental labour are closely connected with changes in and growth of the material means of production, and correspond to the degree of development of the productive forces. At various stages in the historical development of human society, the forms of mental production assume different characteristics. "If we are to examine the connection between mental and material production, it is above all necessary that we should contemplate material production, not under the aspect of a universal category, but under the aspect of this or that definite historical form of material production. Thus, for example, mental production has a different nature under capitalist conditions from that which it had during the Middle Ages. Unless we are dealing with material production under some specific historical form, it is impossible to grasp the peculiarities of the corresponding form of mental production or to understand the mutual interactions between mental and material production." (Marx, *Theorien über den Mehrwert*, Vol. I, p. 381.)

A given form of material production requires this or that social division of labour, and the latter lies at the foundation of the mental division of labour. The study of social evolution shows us that as soon as the days of primitive society were over, the division of labour began, for there appeared a large number of specialised varieties and sub-varieties of social labour, this being accompanied by an appropriate division of labour in the mental and organisational sphere.

"In every society," writes Engels in his *Anti-Dühring*, "where production develops as though it were a natural process—and contemporary society is such a one—it is not the producers who rule the means of production but the means of production which rule the producers. In such a society, every new lever of production necessarily becomes transformed into a new means for placing the producer under the yoke of the means of production. This applies, above all, to that lever of production which, until the rise of largescale industry, was the most powerful, *i.e.*, the division of labour. Already in the days of the first division of labour on an extended scale, in the days when town and countryside became divorced from one another, the rural population

was condemned to long centuries of mental torpor, while the town workers were condemned to be enslaved, each by his special occupation. This state of things stunted the intellectual development of the rural workers, and hindered the physical development of the town dwellers. While it may be contended that the peasant is the lord of the soil he tills, and the craftsman the lord of the craft he practices, it is equally true that the land owns the peasant and the craft the handicraftsman. With the division of labour, man himself became a divided being. All other bodily and mental faculties were sacrificed to the development of one. This crippling of men's capacities increases concomitantly with the growth of the division of labour which finds its highest development in manufacture. The system of manufacture divides the craft up into many partial operations each of which is performed by some particular workers and constitutes such a worker's whole occupation in life; it enslaves the worker for his lifetime, constraining him to perform a definite and partial function and manipulate one specialised instrument of labour . . . Nor is this thralldom confined to the workers. Those also belonging to the classes which directly or indirectly exploit the workers are by the division of labour enslaved to the instrument of their own activity—the narrow-minded bourgeois to his own capital and to his own lust for profit; the lawyer to his hidebound legalist conceptions which hold dominion over him as an independent force; the 'cultured classes' to manifold local prejudices and partiality, to their own physical inadequacy and their own intellectual myopia, to the maiming effect of an unduly specialised education, and to the livelong reiteration of futile activities." (Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, Published by Burmon Publishing House, P. 276-77.)

The individualisation of various specialities, such as technical knowledge, teaching, military training, and administration or management, leads to a concentration of learning and experience in the hands of the ruling classes and to the spiritual impoverishment of the labouring masses. This division of labour in society, thanks to which all the hewers of wood and drawers of water belong to a class apart, is serious enough; but the dull specialisation, the increasing severance between mental and physical labour, that has ensued upon the development of the manufacturing system, is in some respects even more disastrous.

"The independent peasant or handicraftsman develops knowledge, insight, and will, even though it be only to a moderate extent. The

savage exercises all the arts of war as manifestations of personal cunning. Under the manufacturing system, these faculties are now needed only by the workshop as a whole. Intelligence in production is amplified in one direction because it disappears in numerous other directions. What the detail workers lose, is concentrated in the capital that employs them. As a result of the manufacturing division of labour, the worker is confronted by the intellectual powers of the material process of production whose property, whose slave, he has become. This process begins in simple co-operation, in which the capitalist, as against the individual workers, represents the unity and the will of the associated working organism. It goes further still in manufacture, which cripples the workers by making them into detail workers. It is completed in large-scale industry, which detaches science from labour, making of science an independent force of production, and pressing it into the service of capital." (Marx, *Capital*, I, 382.)

The organisation of popular education in capitalist society is so arranged as to perpetuate the mental spoliation of the masses. But the growth of the working-class movement forces the ruling classes to introduce reforms, be they never so paltry, into the sphere of popular education. Of course such reforms in no way lessen the class character of education in modern capitalist countries, and its complete subservience to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Like bourgeois ideologists to-day, in the feudalist epoch the philosophical defenders of serfdom were eager to point out that the destruction of feudalist production, and, simultaneously, the destruction of the corresponding mental production, would entail terrible losses on society. The bourgeois in those days unhesitatingly criticised the corporative character of the old system of education, caustically scoffing at every kind of mental activity which their fathers had regarded with esteem. Economists like Adam Smith and Ricardo, in their turn, showed how unproductive a large number of trades were because they were still more or less dominated by the old feudalist conditions of production, which had grown up under feudalism and were adapted to the needs of feudalism.

"The labour of some of the most highly respected classes of society is just as little productive as the labour of servants. Take, for instance, a territorial sovereign, with all his justices and army officers and, indeed, the whole army and navy—the lot of them are unproductive labourers. They are servants of the public, and are maintained by part of the yearly

product of the diligence of other persons. . . . To the same class belong priests, lawyers, men of letters, doctors, comedians, jugglers, musicians, opera singers, ballet dancers etc." (Marx, *Theorien uber den Mehrwert*, 1, 263.) Again: "such is the language used by the bourgeoisie in its revolutionary days, before it has won dominion over the whole of society, has grasped all the powers of the State. These transcendental occupations, ancient and venerable, that of sovereign, judge, army officer, priest, and so on, the totality of the old-established estates from which they spring, their savants, their teachers, their men of the cloth, are placed in the same economic category as the whole swarm of lackeys and entertainers who serve their own needs and those of the idle rich (the territorial nobility and the capitalists who are mere sleeping partners)." Intellectuals, those who carry on the "transcendental occupations," are, says the bourgeoisie in its revolutionary days, "no more than servants of the public, just as the others in their turn are their servants. They live upon the product of the diligence of others, and must therefore be reduced to the lowest possible number. State, Church, etc., are only entitled to exist in so far as they are committees for the administration or management of the joint interests of the productive bourgeois; and their costs which belong to the incidental expenses of production, must be reduced to the indispensable minimum. This view is of historical interest in that it contrasts so sharply, on the one hand with the view held in classical antiquity, when materially productive labour bore the degrading imprint of slavery, and was regarded as nothing more than the pedestal on which the leisured burgher was to stand; and, on the other hand, with the view that prevailed under the system of absolute or aristocratic monarchy which was established upon the ruins of medievalism. The latter view is naively expressed by Montesquieu, who had not emancipated himself from its absurdity. He writes (*Esprit des lois*, book VII, chapter 4): 'Unless the rich spend freely, the poor will die of hunger.' When, on the other hand, the bourgeoisie has been victorious (in part by itself getting control of the State, and in part by effecting a compromise with the former rulers); when it has recognised the ideological estates as flesh of its own flesh, and has made of them its own functionaries, people after its own kidney; when it has ceased to contrapose itself as representative of productive labour to these others as an unproductive class; when the genuinely productive workers have in their turn raised their heads against the bourgeois, declaring that bourgeois are persons who live on the labour of others; as soon as the

bourgeoisie has grown sufficiently enlightened not to devote itself wholly to production, and aspires also to consume in an 'enlightened' fashion; as soon as intellectual workers incline more and more enter the service of the bourgeoisie, the service of capitalist production—there is a transformation scene, and the bourgeoisie tries to find from its own standpoint an 'economic' justification for the very things it had formerly criticised and attacked." (Marx, *Theorien uber den Mehrwert*, I, 405-406.)

The bourgeoisie, and its hangers-on—teachers, various experts and philosophers—have so completely forgotten all this, that they regard every attack on bourgeois culture as an attack on culture in general. The whole system of secondary and higher education is directed towards the production of servitors of and apologists for the bourgeois social order. The bourgeoisie makes use of the experience of its erstwhile foes, and to an even greater degree than the feudalists does it attract to the ranks of its faithful servants exceptionally able members of the "lower orders," guaranteeing them a privileged position and allotting them a place at the bourgeois table—precisely as of old the aristocracy had felt it expedient to do in respect of the bourgeois upstart.

Meanwhile capitalist production itself prepares the material conditions for the emergence of new forms of mental production, able to engage the activities of very large sections of the working population. The factory needs workers who are able to read and write; new and better means of transport and communication are essential to largescale industry. Consequently factory legislation insists upon the elementary education of the workers. "As we can learn in detail from a study of the life work of Robert Owen, the germs of the education of the future are to be found in the factory system. This will be an education which, in the case of every child over a certain age, will combine productive labour with instruction and physical culture, not only as a means for increasing social production, but as the only way of producing fully developed human beings." (Marx, *Capital*, I, p. 522.) "But if, on the one hand, incessant changes of work impose themselves as an overriding law of nature, operating with the blindly destructive energy of such a law when its working encounters obstacles everywhere; on the other hand, large-scale industry, through its catastrophes, imposes the necessity that, as a matter of life or death, changes in work and the utmost possible versatility of the workers shall be recognised as general laws of social production, so that production must be adapted to the

normal functioning of these laws. Under large-scale industry, it also become a life-and-death question that the monstrosity of an unhappy reserve army of labour kept at the disposal of capital for its varying needs in the way of exploitation, shall be replaced by the perfect adaptability of the individual human being to the changing demands for different kinds of labour; so that the detail worker, who has nothing more to perform than a partial social function, shall be superseded by an individual with an all-round development, one for whom various social functions are alternative modes of activity. Factors of this metamorphosis, factors which are a natural growth upon the foundation of large-scale industry, are polytechnic and agricultural schools; other factors are schools of craft training in which the children of the workers receive specialised instruction in technology and in the practical use of the various instruments of production. Although the factory acts, representing primary concessions wrung from capital, are content to combine elementary instruction with factory work, there can be no doubt that the inevitable conquest of political power by the working class will be followed by a movement in which technological instruction, both theoretical and practical, will win its place in the labour schools. Nor is there any doubt that the capitalist form of production, and the politico-economical labour conditions appropriate to that form of production, are diametrically opposed to all such revolutionary ferments, and to their aim—the abolition of the old division of labour.” (Marx, *Capital*, I, p. 526-527.)

It is only by the destruction of the class character of society, by liberating the proletariat from the curse of exclusively physical and automatic labour, that the material conditions can be created for communist intellectual production. It is only by freeing science from the yoke of the class rule of exploiters, from degradation at the hands of a munificent Rockefeller “sacrificing” millions of dollars for the benefit of science, and then proceeding, in the name of “the last word in scientific discovery,” to extract millions of dollars from the proletariat; it is only by liberating science and art from their enforced subservience to capitalist patrons; that we shall be able to transform the whole of society into a free association of persons who will have scope for developing all their faculties to the full. Equipped with scientific knowledge, mankind will then continue the struggle with nature, freed from the prejudices inseparable from a system in which one man exploits another.

40. SUPPOSED FIXITY OF THE BOURGEOIS TYPE OF SOCIETY.

BOURGEOIS thinkers habitually regard bourgeois conditions as sempiternal. But Marx shows the contrary.

"Economists are strange creatures. For them there are but two kinds of institutions; works of art, and works of nature. Feudal institutions are artificial, bourgeois institutions are natural. In this matter, economists are like theologians, for whom there are only two kinds of religion. Every religion other than their own is the invention of man, whereas their own particular brand of religion is an emanation from God. When they declare extant relations (those prevailing in bourgeois production) to be 'natural,' they would have us understand that such relations are responsible for the creation of wealth and for the development of the forces of production according to the laws of nature. These relations themselves are, they contend, natural laws, independent of the influence of time. They declare that such relations constitute everlasting laws, laws which must govern society for all time. There has been history, but now history is finished! History there must have been, seeing that we have evidence of the existence of feudal institutions and that within those feudal institutions we discover relations of production differing wholly from those prevalent in bourgeois society, bourgeois relations of production which our economists would fain have us believe to be natural and forsooth eternal." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, P. 95.)

It is highly important from the bourgeois point of view to make people believe that the laws governing society to-day are eternal, and to instil a conviction that any violation of these laws is an atrocious crime. Hence arises the bourgeois passion for standing on the firm ground of legality. Even when the bourgeois class is engaged in revolutionary deeds, the traditional semblance of legality must be maintained.

When, in February 1849, Marx was tried for advocating armed resistance against the tax collector, he defended his action in the following words:

"But, gentlemen, what do you understand by the term 'maintenance of the legal foundation'?

"The maintenance of laws which belong to a past epoch of society, which were made by the representatives of vanished or vanishing social

interests; and it is only these interests, that conflict with the general needs, to which you give the sanction of law.

"But society does not rest upon law. That is a legalist illusion.

"Nay, rather, law must rest upon society; it must be the expression of the common interests and needs of society, of those which arise out of the extant material methods of production and which conflict with the arbitrary will of the individual.

"Here in my hand is the Code Napoleon, which did not create modern bourgeois society. On the contrary, bourgeois society, originating in the eighteenth century, merely finds its legal expression in this code. As soon as such a code ceases to correspond to social relations, it is nothing more than a sheaf of papers. You cannot make these old laws the foundation of a new social development, any more than these old laws made the old legal conditions.

"The old laws issued out of the old conditions, and must perish with them. Perforce they change with the changing conditions of life. The maintenance of old laws in defiance of the new needs and claims of social development is, in essence, nothing other than the maintenance of obsolete private interests to the detriment of contemporary general interests.

"This maintenance of the legal foundation implies that such private interests are to be considered dominant when they no longer dominate; it is the expression of a determination to force upon society as valid, laws which are condemned as invalid by the actual living conditions of this society, by its way of providing for its needs, by its commerce, by its methods of material production; it aims at keeping in office legislators who still represent private interests and nothing more; it purposes to misuse the powers of the State in order forcibly to subordinate the interests of the majority to the interests of the minority. Thus moment by moment it comes into conflict with extant needs, hindering commerce and industry, it tends to foster social crises which can readily lead to political revolutions." (*Karl Marx vor den Kölner Geschworenen*, pp. 15-16.)

41. THE FAMILY IN BOURGEOIS SOCIETY.

PRIOR to the time when they composed the Manifesto, Marx and Engels had, more than once, given thought to the question of the family.

Marx dealt in a more detailed manner with the question of the bourgeois family; Engels studied proletarian family relationships.

The bourgeoisie is for ever talking about the sacredness of family relationships. In order to veil the unsavoury picture of reality, they make use of hypocritical phraseology. Long since has bourgeois marriage become a commercial transaction, long since has it lost those characteristics of tenderness and sincerity about which the bourgeois ideologists love to prate.

“The bourgeois attitude towards the institutions of the bourgeois regime is like that of the Jew towards the Law. In individual instances, the bourgeois ignores these institutions to suit his own convenience, but he wants every one else to abide by them. If bourgeois in the mass were to disregard bourgeois institutions, they would cease to be bourgeois—and naturally this is far from their desire, so that they never dream of doing anything of the kind. A bourgeois who is of a lecherous disposition disregards the sanctity of marriage and becomes a secret adulterer; the merchant ignores the sanctity of property, inasmuch as he deprives others of their property by speculation, bankruptcy, etc.; the young bourgeois makes himself independent of his family whenever he can, and thus in practice breaks up the family: but, in theory, marriage, property, and the family remain sacrosanct, because in practice they are the foundations on which the bourgeoisie has established its dominion, because in their bourgeois form they are the conditions which make the bourgeois a bourgeois—just as the Law which he perpetually evades makes the religious Jew a religious Jew. This relation between the bourgeois and the conditions of his existence acquires one of its generalised forms in bourgeois morality. We make a mistake when we speak of ‘the’ family without qualification. Historically, the bourgeoisie endows the family with the characteristics of the bourgeois family, whose ties are boredom and money, and one of whose peculiarities is the bourgeois dissolution of the family what time the family continues to exist. Its befouled existence is set off by the sacredness of the idea of the family in official parlance and in every-day hypocritical locutions. Where the family has really been dissolved, as among the proletariat, the conditions that obtain are the precise opposite of those fancied by Stirner. There, the concept of the family does not exist at all, though here and there we find genuine family feeling based upon extremely concrete conditions. In the eighteenth century, the concept of the family was dissipated by the philosophers because, at the highest levels

of civilisation, the actual family was already in course of dissolution. The inner ties of the family, the individual parts out of which the concept of family life is made up, such as obedience, affection, conjugal fidelity, etc., had vanished; but the real body of the family, property relations, an exclusive attitude towards other families, an enforced life in common—the conditions that were determined by the existence of children, by the structure of modern towns, by the development of capital, etc.—these persisted, despite considerable modifications. They persisted because the existence of the family is necessitated by its connection with the bourgeois method of production, which is independent of the will of bourgeois society. How indispensable the family is to bourgeois society can best be learned from a study of the French revolution, during which for a short time the family was, so far as law was concerned, virtually abolished. The family does actually continue to exist in the nineteenth century, with this reservation, that its dissolution has become more general, not on theoretical grounds, but because of the more extensive development of industry and competition.” (Marx on Stirner, *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, III, pp. 126-27.)

The break-up of the bourgeois family is discussed with peculiar lucidity in the writings of the great utopists, and especially in those of Fourier. In the *Holy Family*, Marx and Engels quote Fourier's “masterly account of marriage,” and comment on it in words which embody the same thought-trend that is revealed in the relevant passages of the Manifesto.

“Adultery, seduction, is an honour to the seducer, is looked upon as quite the thing But the poor girl! Infanticide, what a terrible crime! If she clings to her honour, she must destroy the evidence of dishonour; but when she sacrifices her child to the prejudices of the world she is regarded as even more blameworthy, and is herself sacrificed to the prejudices of the law This is the vicious circle in which all the mechanism of civilisation moves The young girl, what is she but merchandise offered for sale to the first comer to able to negotiate for her exclusive possession Just as in grammar two negatives make an affirmative, so we may say that in the marriage mart two prostitutions make a virtue The changes in a historical epoch may always be inferred from the comparative freedom of women in one part of it or another, for in an improvement in the relations between women and men, between the weak and the strong, we see most clearly the victory of human nature over the nature of the brute. The degree of the emancipation of

woman is a natural standard of the general emancipation The debasement of the female sex is an essential character trait of civilisation no less than of barbarism, with this difference, that under civilisation all the vices which barbarism practices in a simple and straightforward way, are now preserved in a complicated, ambiguous, and hypocritical semblance When woman is kept enslaved, man suffers from this even more than woman herself. (Marx and Engels, *Die Heilige Familie*, chapter viii, section 6—reprinted in *Nachlass*, II, pp. 308-309.)

During the nineteenth century, prostitution, pimping, and trafficking in human flesh (the white slave trade), became special branches of commercial enterprise, with ramifications throughout the world, spreading venereal diseases far and wide. Such are the results of bourgeois family institutions and bourgeois marriage.

In his *Conditions of the Working Class in England*, Engels gives us a picture of the proletarian family. He shows that drunkenness and debauchery are conspicuous vices among the workers who have not yet become class-conscious members of the army of labour, and who submissively accept the bourgeois social order.

"If people are condemned to live in conditions which arouse their lowest instincts only, then no course of action is open to them save rebellion or a relapse into something lower than the brute. Moreover, the bourgeoisie contributes its further share to this debasement by directly encouraging prostitution. How many of the forty thousand prostitutes who walk the streets of London owe their livelihood to the virtuous bourgeoisie? How many of these women have, in the first instance, been seduced by a bourgeois, and afterwards constrained to market their bodies to any casual passer by?" (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 131; cf. English translation, p. 128.)

Although the bourgeoisie has the material possibilities for the creation of suitable conditions for a happy family life, yet the capitalist system at the very outset poisons the home by its all-pervading spirit of mercantilism. The worker, likewise, under the harrow of want, is incapable of making a home for himself and his family. "It is almost impossible for a worker to make a proper home for himself and his family under the present social order. The house he lives in is comfortless and filthy; it is hardly fit to provide even a shelter for the night; his home is ill-furnished, often neither rainproof nor warm; the overcrowded rooms reek of foul air; no domestic amenity is possible.

The husband is out at work all day; maybe even the wife and the children are employed away from the home; they probably all have to go to different places for their day's labour. They meet only in the morning and at night; they are perpetually exposed to the temptation of drowning their misery in drink. Is any family life possible under such circumstances?" (Engels, *Lage*, etc., p. 132; cf. English translation, p. 129.)

A powerful factor contributing to the disruption of family life is the employment of women in the factory. If the mother goes out daily to work in the factory, and her husband is likewise out at work, the children are left without any one to care for them. They grow up like weeds by the wayside, or else they are sent to an institution.

Women's labour in the factory has an even more deleterious effect upon morals. In a confined space, such as the workshop, people of both sexes are crowded together; they have the merest smattering of education, and have not developed a high ethical standard. What are the consequences? Precisely the same as those resulting from the overcrowded conditions of working-class dwellings—so different from the quarters occupied by the wealthier members of the population. In addition, there is the power exercised over women and girls by the factory owner himself or his manager, a power, which as even bourgeois investigators have had to admit, is exercised to an unforfeitable extent.

Large-scale industry, by compelling the employment of women and children in the factory, destroys the erstwhile family relationships, and completely transforms the relationship between parents and children, between man and wife. The father, from being the breadwinner, is converted into an exploiter of his own offspring whose capacities he sells in the labour market until such time as factory legislation comes to place a limit on these transactions. The wife, from being the guardian of the home, is transformed into the most lucrative object of capitalist exploitation. The children and young persons in their turn, are changed into independent workers, severed from parental control; their relationship to father and mother is profoundly different from that which existed under the "patriarchal" conditions of yore. So long as the family is based upon property relations, so long as it is dominated by private interests, so long as one or the other member of the family is in a position to base his claims upon the amount of his contribution to the family budget, so long will

this topsy-turvy distribution of roles persist, and even proletarian family life be destroyed.

Nevertheless, large-scale industry creates the elements for the evolution of a new kind of family. "However terrible, however repulsive, the break-up of the old family system within the organism of capitalist society may seem; none the less, large-scale industry, by assigning to women and to young persons and children of both sexes, a decisive role in the socially organised process of production, and a role which has to be fulfilled outside the home, is building the new economic foundation for a higher form of the family and of the relations between the sexes. I need hardly say that it is just as stupid to regard the Christo-Teutonic form of the family as absolute, as it is to take the same view of the classical Roman form, or of the classical Greek form, or of the oriental form—which, by the by, constitute a historically interconnected developmental series. It is plain moreover, that the composition of the combined labour personnel out of individuals of both sexes and various ages—although in its spontaneously developed and brutal capitalist form (wherein the worker exists for the process of production instead of the process of production existing for the worker), it is a pestilential source of corruption and slavery—under suitable conditions cannot fail to be transformed into a source of human progress." (Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1, 529.)

For a fuller consideration of marriage and of family relationships from the outlook of scientific socialism, I must refer the student to Engels' book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. Although some of its conclusions in regard to the historical results of various forms of marriage have now been superseded, nevertheless the picture Engels draws of family relationships during the epoch of bourgeois civilisation (dominated as that civilisation is by private interests, cash payments, and so forth) remains unsurpassed. It combines the unsparing criticism of Fourier with the marvellous analytical method used by Marx in *Capital*.

This is not the place for a detailed study of the views upon marriage, and the family held by various socialists and communists down to Marx's and Engels' day, though such a study would certainly be of interest. Especially interesting indeed, would be a study of the writings of the Saint-Simonians and the materialist communists who hold that bourgeois marriage and bourgeois family relationship must be entirely done away with.

42. THE WORKERS AND "THEIR" COUNTRY

THE worker has no country. This idea is to be found in all communist literature, whether emanating from France or from Germany, before the date when the Manifesto saw the light of day. The Manifesto merely dots the i's and crosses the t's, by emphasising the fact that the "country" about which bourgeois spokesmen are so fond of prating, does not exist so far as the workers are concerned.

In proportion as the proletariat becomes class conscious, it generalises the partial struggles of its various sections into a national class struggle. The arena wherein it wages this combat is within the frontiers of the national State, whose government is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. That is why (if not in actual fact, at least in semblance), the struggle of the proletariat is above all a national struggle, *i.e.*, it occurs within the boundaries of a specific nation. Only a section of the nation, the bourgeoisie, has created for itself within the national framework that thing which goes by the name of "country," "fatherland." So long as the proletariat has not become a class on its own account, permeated with an awareness of itself as a class, so long as it is not class conscious, just so long will the national class State seem even to the workers to be their "fatherland." Moreover, even when the proletariat becomes conscious of itself as a class and endeavours to seize political power, it remains a national unit desirous of establishing itself as the ruling class within the national boundaries. In this sense, the proletariat certainly does retain a national complexion. In proportion as national individualism weakens and the ties between the various nations strengthen, national peculiarities will become less marked. For all that, the national State will persist. The struggle of the proletariat in various lands will become more homogeneous, the program of the workers throughout the world will become identical, and the struggle will assume international proportions. Nothing but a social revolution on a world scale, nothing but the worldwide establishment of the rule of the proletariat, will create the conditions under which the process of internationalisation (already perceptible under capitalist conditions) will be enormously speeded up, and under which national antagonisms and the class struggle will both cease to exist. Unless the workers, throughout the larger civilised lands at least, can form a united force, their liberation in any one land, within the confines of any one nation, will encounter formidable difficulties.

The bourgeois idea of "fatherland" signifies strife between nations,

a strife which is sometimes open and sometimes secret; it signifies national exclusiveness; it signifies the oppression of one nation by another. The relations between the capitalists of one nation are reproduced between those of various nationalities. Just as a capitalist will compete with another capitalist of the same nationality, will worst him in the struggle and pocket his capital, or place him in a position of personal dependence, so in the international arena one capitalist government will outlive another, will add the opposing country to its possessions, will make the conquered nation a dependency. The recent imperialist war has shown that a spirit of submission to the bourgeois order is still prevalent among the workers of Europe. This means that the proletariat is not yet a homogeneous body even within the national frontiers; that it is still divided into groups; that it is not one solidarised class which acknowledges one single aim, namely, the organisation of the workers as the ruling class, the creation of the proletarian State. The more intimate the union between the workers' parties of various lands, the more the struggle against the national bourgeoisie is converted from an individual exchange of hostilities into a generalised fight, the more the war of classes is transferred from the national to the international field, the more the workers become in very truth an international brotherhood—the more will the victory of the social revolution be hastened and its prospects improved. From the very outset of their revolutionary career, Marx and Engels made internationalism the cornerstone of their activities. Their "fatherland" was the nearest place where a struggle between workers and capitalists was proceeding; their energies were concentrated on the task of strengthening the international ties of the proletariat; their will was bent to the creation of an international organisation of communists. Even before the formation of the Communist League, these two men took part in all the attempts which were being made both in England and in Belgium to set up democratic organisations on an international scale. In the year 1846, they emphasised the need for changing the old slogan "the brotherhood of the nations" into "the brotherhood of the proletarians of all lands." After an international meeting in London, Engels wrote:

"To conclude, it is only in a socialist sense that the brotherhood of the nations has any meaning to-day. The chimera of a European republic, of perpetual peace under the extant political organisation, has become as ludicrous as phrasemaking about a union of the peoples under the aegis of the universal freedom of trade. But at the very

time when fantastic sentimentalism of this sort has gone out of fashion, the proletarians of all nations are beginning, unostentatiously but effectively, to fraternise under the banner of communist democracy. Moreover, it is only the proletarians who are really able to fraternise in this way. In each country the bourgeoisie has its own special interests, and bourgeois, since for them interest is supreme, can never transcend the claims of nationalism. A handful of theorists, their pretty 'principles' notwithstanding, can achieve nothing here, for conflicting interests and the inertia of the thing that is defy the phasemakers. Proletarians, on the other hand, have in every country one and the same interest, one and the same enemy, one and the same war to wage. The great majority of proletarians are, thanks to their very nature, devoid of national prejudices, and their whole culture and movement are essentially humanist and anti-national. None but proletarians can destroy nationalism; only the awakening proletariat can establish the brotherhood of the nations." (*Nachlass*, II, 460.)

43. THE CLASS WAR AND THE HISTORICAL PROCESS

THE Manifesto is a vivid incorporation of the new philosophy of history; it paints the picture of the historical process which leads to the birth and the growth of the class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. In the forefront it places the dramatic element, the war of the classes. The Manifesto shows how the class war depends upon this or that factor of social and economic relations; how the struggle of the proletariat for freedom is a necessary phenomenon in the course of history, just as the struggle of the bourgeoisie was in earlier days; how the growth of large-scale industry creates all the elements needed for the establishment of a new economic order. Never have Marx and Engels claimed that they "discovered" the class war in history. On the contrary, they were careful to show that already in the bourgeois history books of the English restoration period (that is to say, long before Marx's and Engels' day) the historical development of the struggle between classes was portrayed. Furthermore, bourgeois economists laid bare the economic structure of these classes. Marx did no more than make the facts common knowledge; and he thus cleared out, once for all, from the realm of history the romantic spoof about heroes and great leaders, etc., who were supposed to have "made" history. He demonstrated that the existence of classes is closely connected with the degree to which production has developed in a given historical

epoch; he showed that the war of the classes in its most recent phases must inevitably lead to the seizure of political power by the proletariat. The class war as the motive force of history; the origin of classes in society; the transformation of separate groups of persons united by common interests into a coherent class existing as an independent entity; the growth of class consciousness among the workers; the creation of a class mentality; the emergence of a class outlook on world affairs (an attitude of mind arising out of the material conditions existing within that class)—all these considerations led Marx little by little to the formulation of his materialist interpretation of history. One of the first things needed was to uproot the generally accepted ideas concerning religion. Feuerbach, the German philosopher (1804-1872), had already pointed out that in the religious world, consciousness was determined by existence, thought by being; that it is not religion which creates man, but man who creates religion. Marx went further. He maintained that it is not the individual man who confronts nature, but mankind as a whole; that consciousness is not determined by the individual existence, but by the generality of existences. Religion, he tells us, is explained, "not by 'self-consciousness' and similar futilities, but by the prevailing method of production and exchange, which is as completely independent of pure understanding as the invention of the power-loom and the introduction of railways are independent of the philosophy of Hegel."

Marx dealt in the same way with other forms of ideology: "Social relations are closely interconnected with the forces of production. When they acquire new forces of production, people change the method of production, and concomitantly with the change in the method of production, with the change in the way they gain their livelihood, there ensues a change in all their social relations. The hand mill gives us a society with feudal lords; the steam-power mill gives us a society with industrial capitalists. But the very same persons who model social relations in conformity with the prevailing material methods of production, also model principles, ideas, categories, in accordance with the prevailing social relations. Thus we see that these ideas, these categories, are no more eternal than are the conditions, the relations, they express. They are historical, transitory, fugitive products." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, P. 86.)

To those who contend that ideas, principles, and so forth, create

history, Marx replies with the following definition of the tasks confronting the students of history:

"If we ask ourselves . . . why a given principle made its appearance in the eleventh century or in the eighteenth, and not in some other century, we shall find it necessary to study with close attention what people were like in the eleventh century or in the eighteenth, as the case may be; to ascertain what their special needs were in the century with which we are concerned, what were the productive forces at that time, the methods of production and the raw materials in general use; what, finally, were the relations between man and man, resulting from the before-mentioned conditions of existence. What does the study of all these questions mean but to write the actual and everyday history of the people of each century, to describe them as at one and the same time the authors of and the actors in their own drama?" (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, P. 91.)

But what about the revolutionary idea directed against extant society? Is there not a wide and ever wider spread of the conviction that the exploitation of man by man must be put an end to, must be destroyed; that such exploitation is immoral? Does the spread of such convictions not show that an idea can create a revolutionary frame of mind? Engels writes: "When the moral consciousness of the masses declares this, that, or other economic phenomenon to be wrong, as happened at one time in the case of slavery and at another in the case of serfdom, this means that the phenomenon in question has already outlived its time, that new economic conditions have arisen, thanks to which the old ones have become intolerable, and must be swept away."

This is no more than a sign that within the old society a new social order is taking shape.

The class character of society determines the class character of the ideas prevalent in such a society. "Our feelings, our illusions, our ideas, our philosophies, are but a superstructure grounded upon different forms of property, upon varying social conditions. Each class upbuilds this superstructure for itself, upon the basis of its special material conditions and its peculiar social relations. But the individual, who acquires his feelings and his ideas through tradition and education, is prone to imagine that they are the fundamental motives, the real starting-point of his activities."

In so far as various classes are linked together in a common histo-

rical destiny and confined within one and the same social system, just so far will the outlooks of those classes have certain traits in common. But these traits recede into the background and are purely secondary in importance when compared with the specific features appertaining to the psychological make-up of each class in itself. The class war in the economic and political field corresponds to the war in the realm of ideas. The psychology of the ruling class sets its seal upon the whole of the historical epoch during which that class is developing its special attributes. It is a ruling-class psychology. To quote the Manifesto's paraphrase of Goethe's dictum: "In every epoch, the ruling ideas have been the ideas of the ruling class." (See above P. 30.)

44. EVOLUTION IN ETHICS, SOCIOLOGY, AND NATURAL SCIENCE

THE unceasing change in peoples' ideas of what is "right" and what is "wrong" suffices to show how little "morality" can be regarded as something that persists unaltered throughout the general mutations of the historical process. The "morality" of one epoch becomes the "immorality" of another. Writing in 1878, Engels said:

"What sort of morality is instilled into us to-day? First of all we have the Christian ethic of feudal days, handed down to us from an earlier epoch. This is divided into a Catholic moral code and a Protestant moral code. Of these codes we have further subdivisions, ranging from the Jesuit-Catholic and the orthodox-Protestant to the comparatively lax views of the apostles of the Enlightenment. Alongside all these we have, further, the modern bourgeois ethic, and the proletarian ethic of a future day. Thus, in the more advanced countries of Europe alone, there are three groups of ethical theories to be found simultaneously: the ethical theories of the past, the present, and the future. Which theory is the true one? Not one of the three is true for all time. But certainly the ethic which will possess the largest number of elements likely to be durable, will be the ethic which represents in the present, the revolutionising of the present; the ethic, therefore, which represents the future; in a word, the proletarian ethic.

"We see, therefore, that of the three classes which go to make up modern society (the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and the proletariat), each has its own code of morals. From this we may conclude

that men, consciously or unconsciously, create their moral outlooks in the last resort out of the conditions of everyday, practical experience, the conditions upon which they depend as a class, *i.e.*, out of the economic conditions of production and exchange.

"But there is one thing which is common to all three of these moral codes. Could not this common factor constitute at least a part of a durable moral code? The ethical theories referred to above represent three stages in one and the same historical process of development. They have, therefore, a historical background which is common to them all and for this very reason necessarily have much in common. Nay, more. In identical or approximately identical stages of economic development, there will necessarily be a more or less complete agreement between the moral theories held in these respective epochs. Directly private ownership in personal things became the vogue, every society wherein private ownership was countenanced had to enforce the moral commandment: 'Thou shalt not steal.' Is this commandment likely to endure for all time? By no means. In a society where the motive to theft is lacking, where in the long run only mentally abnormal persons will be prompted to steal, a man would be laughed out of court should he endeavour to preach such an 'eternal verity' as: 'Thou shalt not steal!'" (Engels, *Anti Duhring*, p. 89.)

At the date when the Manifesto was first published, the idea of evolution of change, had still to make its way into the domain of official science. Towards the close of the thirties, Jakob Schleiden (1804-1881) and Theodor Schwann (1810-1882), two German men of science, founded the cell-theory of animal and vegetable structure, and proved that cells are the elementary units of all living matter. The science of organic development received a great impetus from the work of Karl Ernst Baer (1792-1876), and this fostered the progress of the general theory of the evolution of living forms.

In the realm of geology, the old cataclysmic theory of development for which the French naturalist Cuvier (1769-1832) had been mainly responsible, now gave place to newer theories. The view that geological epochs succeed one another, not by upheavals, revolutions, sudden cataclysms, but in virtue of a summation of gradual changes, had indeed been put forward before Cuvier's day by James Hutton (1726-1797), the Scottish geologist. But it was left for Charles Lyall (1797-1875) to give the cataclysmic theory its quietus.

The chasm between inorganic matter and organic matter had

already been bridged. Justus von Liebig's (1803-1873) contributions to chemistry were as early as the forties, highly appreciated by both Marx and Engels. Liebig and other chemists were able to show that carbon, the most important of the elements they had isolated, was extracted from the atmosphere by plants, and that vegetable growths transformed inorganic matter into organic matter. Thus the law of the indestructibility of matter, discovered as regards inorganic matter by the French chemist Lavoisier (1743-1794), was now extended to the realm of organic matter as well. In 1828, the German chemist Friedrich Wohler (1800-1882), scored a great achievement by breaking down the barrier previously held to exist between organic and inorganic chemistry, by artificially, in his laboratory, preparing urea, one of the substances which up to that time it had been thought could only be produced through the agency of "vital force." Robert Mayer (1814-1878) and Helmholtz (1821-1894), both of them German men of science, had propounded the theory of the conservation of energy, and the publication of their works upon this question almost coincided with the first appearance of the Manifesto. The theory of the conservation of energy expelled from the study of organisms that mysterious "vital force" which was supposed to dwell in matter. The spook of vital force was put to flight by the scientific recognition that the material forces of nature are interchangeable; that, just as matter persists, so energy is conserved, without loss, whatever the outward forms in which the one or the other may temporarily manifest itself.

Eleven years after the publication of the Manifesto, Darwin's (1809-1882) epoch-making book on the *Origin of Species* made its appearance. By that date, 1859, Marx had already formulated his theory of the evolution of capitalist society (a social form which he looked upon as a special phase in the historical process). Almost simultaneously with the *Origin of Species*, Marx's work *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie* was published. Darwin's book dealt with the theory of the evolution of living things, or, as he phrased it, with the origin of species by natural selection. Thus, what Darwin did for biology, Marx did for sociology. The growth of the anthropological and ethnological sciences; a deeper knowledge of historical institutions; the application of the historical method to the study of the phenomena of social life, such as religion, morals, literature, art, law, politics—all these began to assume their modern aspect in the course of the eighteen-sixties, under the influence of Darwin's and Marx's theories. The tremendous amount of material collected at that time

has never been thoroughly worked up, has never been fully co-ordinated so as to form a constructive picture of the historical course of development taken by human society. Nevertheless there is no lack of evidence showing the correctness of Marx's opinion (in the preface to the before-mentioned work) that "productive relations . . . correspond to a definite evolutionary phase of the material forces of production. The totality of these productive relations forms the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a legal and political superstructure develops and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political and intellectual processes of life."

45. THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

IN the Manifesto, Marx and Engels make repeated allusions to the conquest of political power by the proletariat, and to the establishment of the rule of the proletariat. In the paragraphs under discussion we read that "the first step in the workers' revolution is to make the proletariat the ruling class," and we are told that the first effect of this will be that the State will become "the proletariat organised as ruling class." The actual expression "dictatorship of the proletariat" is not used, although the basic elements for the idea are already there. I have shown elsewhere that the expression "dictatorship of the proletariat" was coined after the experiences of the February revolution (Paris, 1848), and that Marx and Engels began to make use of the phrase only after the defeat of the French proletariat in the June days (1848), when they were beginning to realise that the proletariat must not be content with seizing political power, but that, having done so, it must go on to destroy the bourgeois government apparatus and to set up a new one in place of the old. They went even further, for they declared it would be necessary, as a temporary measure, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat as a class, a dictatorship which alone would be competent to put an end to the opposition of the exploiters. Only by such means would it be possible for the proletariat to transform the bourgeois State into a proletarian State, to do away with the bourgeoisie as a ruling class and replace it by the proletariat, which in its turn would become the ruling class. This revolutionary socialism, communism, to which the bourgeoisie has given the name of Blanquism (after Auguste Blanqui, 1805-1881, the French publicist and

revolutionist), is contraposed by Marx to the "doctrinaire socialism of those who wish to subordinate the whole movement to one of its factors; of those who would fain substitute the intellectual activities of isolated pedants for the work of communal, of social production; of those, above all, who imagine that petty artifices or sloppy sentimentalism will enable us to shuffle out of the world the need for the revolutionary class struggle." (Marx, *Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich*, 1848-1850, 1895 reprint, p. 94.) Revolutionary socialism, Marx goes on to say in the same passage, "is the declaration of permanent revolution, the establishment of the class dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary step towards the abolition of class distinctions in general, towards the abolition of all the conditions of production on which class distinctions depend, towards the abolition of all the social relations which depend on these conditions of production, towards the revolutionising of all the ideas which emanate from these social relations." (*Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.)

In his criticisms of the Gotha program (*The Socialist Program*, p. 13, column 2), Marx writes: "Between capitalist society and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Correspondent with this there will be a period of political transition during which the State can be nothing other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

He goes on to show that the Gotha program is not concerned with the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, or with the future State-system of communist society. It is merely to serve the purposes of propaganda and to voice political demands. The German party, it expressly declares, is to work "within the framework of the contemporary national State," i.e., of its own State—the Prusso-German Empire. Such a program could not possibly be applicable to the period of revolutionary transition.

Matters are dealt with in a very different spirit in the Manifesto. Here we have a program which is concerned with the period when the proletariat shall have become the ruling class.

Before going on to consider this program more fully, a few words are needed to elucidate another point. The Manifesto tells us that "the first step in the workers' revolution is to make the proletariat the ruling class." And it adds the words, "establish democracy." This is to be understood as meaning "proletarian democracy," in contrast with

“bourgeois democracy”; it means the conquest of so much political power as will provide the fullest political freedom and independence for the working class. Proletarian democracy is as distinct from bourgeois democracy as the proletarian State is distinct from the bourgeois State. The democracy of the working class is the democracy of propertyless persons: The democracy of the bourgeoisie is the democracy of persons of property. At the time of the great French revolution, the bourgeois liberals divided the nation into active and passive citizens; and, under pressure of the Parisian proletariat, the bourgeois democrats extended the suffrage to every category of citizens (with the exception of domestics and journeymen). The fundamental characteristic of democracy is the sovereignty and self-government of the people. Democracy in the fullest sense of the term can only be established when the extant bureaucracy has been completely done away with. Working-class democracy has, therefore, unconditionally to destroy bureaucracy, and must establish the principle of election and the power of recall in all its institutions, whether these be social or governmental. The characteristic traits of an ideal Soviet system are that the Soviets shall function as the organs of the class dominion of the proletariat.

“A bourgeois republic, however democratic, hallowed by the watchwords of the will of the people, the will of the whole nation, the will of all classes, inevitably expresses—through the very fact that it is based upon the private ownership of the land and of other means of production—the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, of a machine for the exploitation and oppression of the immense majority of the workers by the capitalist clique. In contrast with this, proletarian or Soviet democracy transforms the mass organisations of those who are oppressed by the capitalist class, of the proletarians and the semi-proletarians (the poor peasants), that is to say of the immense majority of the population, into the permanent and unified foundation of the entire State apparatus, local and central, from the bottom to the top. Thereby the Soviet State realises, among other things, in an immeasurably wider form than ever before, local self-government, without any sort of authority imposed from above.” (*Program of the Communist Party of Russia*, 1919, ff. 46 and 47, reprinted in Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, *The ABC of Communism*, p. 379.)

46. COMMUNIST PROGRAMME FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD.

For a thorough understanding of the communist program during the transition period we have to realise that we are dealing with the epoch of social revolution when "despotic inroads upon the rights of property" will be made by the proletariat which has become the ruling class. Nor must we forget that the measures enumerated in the Manifesto were thought out in relation to the most advanced countries. Even as far as these countries are concerned, we have to ask ourselves whether the measures in question are universally applicable. Had the program a genuinely international character? Was it no less applicable in France than in Britain, in Germany than in Belgium? Did it include the possibility of the communists putting forward demands of special interest to the workers within the national frontiers?

As previously explained, the items in the transitional program were not drafted exclusively by Marx and Engels. They were formulated by the communists at a congress and were arrived at by collaboration. It was felt that the differences in the social and political situation of the various countries had to be taken into consideration; nor could the degree of development of the working-class movement be ignored. The program put forward proposals which had already been put forward by communists in the past, and which had evoked the minimum of dissent.

The first measure was passionately discussed by the participators in the Chartist movement. The followers of O'Connor (1794-1855), had adopted the scheme advocated by the Land League. The aim here was to create a fresh batch of small holders by buying up large portions of land and parcelling it out among the town workers. The followers of O'Brien (1805-1864), on the other hand, championed the idea of converting the land into a national property, *i.e.*, they upheld the principle of land nationalisation. In this respect, the O'Brienists merely resuscitated the old demands put forward by Thomas Spence (1750-1814), the inventor of a system of land nationalisation whereby self-contained parochial communities were to be established, and the only tax of any kind was to be rent paid to the corporation in which the ownership of the land was vested. In the *Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx demonstrated the capitalist nature of rent. He wrote: "The degradation of the independent cultivator to become a mere worker, a labourer, a wage earner, a man working for an industrial capitalists; the advent of the industrial capitalist into the countryside where he exploits the land

just as he would exploit any other workshop; the conversion of the landowner from a petty sovereign into a commonplace usurer; such are the various relations expressed by rent. . . . Landed property is mobilised in the form of rent, and in this guise becomes an article of commerce. Only when the development of urban industry and the social organisation resulting therefrom have constrained the landowner . . . to look exclusively for a monetary profit from the use of his land to grow products, does rent become possible. Only then does the landowner come to look upon his broad acres as a money-making machine. . . . We can quite well understand why such economists as Mill, Cherbuliez, Hilditch and others, have demanded that all rent should be handed over to the State and should be used for the reduction of taxes. Such a demand is an outcome of the hatred felt by industrial capitalists for landed proprietors. The latter seem to the former useless superfluities in the otherwise harmonious order of bourgeois production." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 125-27.)

We thus see that as early as the eighteen-forties, bourgeois economists were already advocating the absorption of all landrent by the State, and foreshadowing the "single tax" demand of a latter generation of land nationalists.

Marx and Engels championed the idea of the expropriation of the great landowners and the conversion of the land thus acquired into the property of the proletarian State. They contraposed this demand to the demands of bourgeois democracy. "The abolition of feudalism will be the first matter concerning which the bourgeois democrats will be at odds with the workers. As happened in the great French revolution, the petty bourgeois will want to divide up the feudal estates among the peasants, this signifying that the rural proletariat will be left as it is, and a petty-bourgeois peasant class will be found—a class that will become impoverished and indebted, like the French peasantry today. Alike in their own interest and in the interest of the rural proletariat, the workers must resist this scheme. They must insist that the confiscated estates shall remain State property, and shall be used for the establishment of working-class colonies, which the rural proletariat will till co-operatively, with the aid of all the advantages proper to large-scale agriculture. Thus, moreover, the principle of joint ownership will be given a firm foundation amid the unstable conditions of bourgeois ownership. As the democrats join forces with peasant proprietors, so must the workers join forces with the rural proletariat."

(Marx, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess in Köln*, pp. 134-135.)

The second demand, "a vigorously graduated income tax," was suggested by conditions prevailing at that time in British political life. It arose out of the struggle between various sections of the British bourgeoisie, and gradually it was sponsored by the labouring masses in whose name the radicals put it forward as a fundamental requirement.

An enormous increase in the national debt, and the obligation to pay interest on this debt, led to a complete revision of the whole system of taxation. "Since the national debt is buttressed by the public revenue, which must provide whatever sums are needed for the annual payment of interest, etc., the modern system of taxation is a necessary supplement to the system of national loans. The loans enable the government to defray extraordinary expenditure without, for the moment, imposing fresh burdens on the taxpayers; but in the end higher taxes have to be paid in return for this advantage. On the other hand, the increase in taxation due to the accumulation of the debts that are contracted one after another, makes it necessary for the government to have recourse again and again to fresh loans in order to defray new extraordinary expenses. The modern fiscal system, whose pivot is formed by taxes on the necessities of life (of course, making these dearer), therefore bears within itself the germs of an automatic progression. In Holland, where this system was first inaugurated, the noted patriot De Witt extolled it in his *Maxims* as the best system for making the wage earner submissive, frugal, diligent, and—overburdened with labour. Here, however, we are not so much concerned with the disastrous influence which excessive taxation has upon the position of the wage earner, as upon the way in which it leads to the forcible expropriation of peasants, handicraftsmen, in a word, all the members of the lower middle class. About that there are no two opinions, even among bourgeois economists. The expropriative efficacy of excessive taxation is intensified by the protective system, an integral part thereof. The undoubted fact that the national debt and the fiscal system which is its handmaid have had a considerable share in bringing about the capitalisation of wealth and the expropriation of the masses, has led many writers, such as Cobbett, Doubleday (1790-1870), and others, to believe, though wrongly, that this is the chief cause of the poverty of the common people in modern times." (Marx, *Capital*, I., 838-839.)

Cobbett's agitation in the matter of the national debt and the system of taxation proved of the utmost importance. The income tax, introduced by William Pitt (1759-1806), in 1798 "as a temporary measure," had been wrung from the British bourgeoisie in order to get the better of French competition. After the conclusion of peace in 1815, the act was repealed, and, in order that every trace of this "odious" law might be wiped from people's memory, all the documents relating to it were destroyed by fire, at the instigation of Henry Brougham (afterwards Lord Brougham, 1778-1868).

The agitation carried on by Cobbett and by other British radicals now assumed larger proportions and went from victory to victory, not only gaining the sympathy of the petty bourgeoisie, but likewise finding supporters among the working class. The Chartists refused to look upon the reform of the system of taxation as a matter of prime importance, any more than they looked upon the repeal of the corn laws in such a light. Nevertheless they continued Cobbett's work and reinforced his criticisms. Bronterre O'Brien, for instance, emphasised the class character of taxation policy. In the course of the thirties, a petition was presented to parliament, wherein it was recommended that a graduated income tax should be introduced. At last, in 1842, fiscal needs led Peel to revive the income tax. All that now remained to be done was to make this tax a permanent institution, to make it progressive, and to make it sufficiently large.

That there is nothing specifically proletarian or communist about the income tax, that it is one of those inadequate weapons which the workers have taken from the petty bourgeois arsenal, is emphasised by Marx in his criticism of the French radical, Emile de Girardin (1802-1881).

"Fiscal reform is the stalking-horse of all bourgeois of the radical persuasion, it is the specific remedy advocated by every bourgeois economist. From medieval days down to modern times, among burghers of old and the British free traders now, the main bone of contention has been taxation. The aim of fiscal reform is either to do away with the traditional system of taxation, which hampers the growth of industry, or to cheapen the cost of State upkeep, or to ensure a more even distribution of taxation. The bourgeois are all the more eager in their chase after the will o' the wisp of 'equality of taxation,' the more it eludes them. The conditions of distribution, which are directly based upon bourgeois production—the ratios

between wages and profits, profits and interest, landrents and profits—can at most be modified in matters of detail by fiscal changes; they can never in this way be fundamentally transformed. All the debates upon the subject of fiscal reform, all endeavours to improve matters, take it for granted that the bourgeois system will persist for all time. The complete abolition of taxation could only serve to accelerate the growth of bourgeois property and to accentuate the contradictions already existing in the system. Taxes may be advantageous to certain classes and be specially oppressive in regard to others. This state of things is obvious wherever the financial aristocracy holds sway. . . . Only those strata of the population which come midway between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are ruined by taxation, because these strata are not able to shift the burden of taxation on to the shoulders of another class. Every fresh tax imposed upon the proletariat presses that class further down in the social scale; the abolition of an old tax does not raise the worker's wage, it only increases profit. During the revolution, the gigantic increase in the scope of taxation may serve as an attack upon private ownership; yet even in such a case taxation must be a stepping-stone to fresh revolutionary measures, otherwise there will be a return to the erstwhile bourgeois conditions. To cut down taxation, to see that taxation is more evenly distributed, and so forth, are no more than trivial bourgeois reforms. A campaign for the abolition of taxation is 'bourgeois socialism.' Such bourgeois socialism appeals to the industrialists, to the commercial middle classes, to the peasants. The great bourgeoisie, since its world is already the best of all worlds, naturally despises the utopian dreams of a best world! . . . A tax on capital has its merits. All the economists, and especially Ricardo, have pointed out the advantages accruing from a unique tax. The tax on capital, if it were the only tax levied, would at one blow do away with the numerous and costly army of persons who gather in the taxes; it would cause a minimum of interference with the process of production, circulation, and consumption, and is the only tax which affects luxury capital." (Marx, *Nachlass*, III., 435-439.)

For Marx, such demands in the realm of taxation were merely tactical expedients. He judged of their value by the degree to which they constituted a direct attack upon private property. "When the democrats demand proportional taxation, the workers should put in a claim for graduated taxation; when the democrats propose moderate graduation of taxation, the workers should insist on taxation being so steeply graded that the possession of capital on a large scale will be

impossible; when the democrats demand that the national debt shall be regulated, the workers must demand that the State shall be forced into bankruptcy." (Marx, *Enthüllungen*, etc., p. 137.)

Passing to the third demand in the Manifesto, we find that the abolition of the right of inheritance was one of the basic demands of the Saint-Simonians and had been borrowed from them by certain communists. In the Saint-Simonian system, which leaves the main foundations of the capitalist order intact, the abolition of the right of inheritance plays the leading part as a corrective for the injustices of that order, is the main antidote to privileges of birth. In a communist society, where the means of production will be communally owned, where private property has been abolished except for the simple ownership of articles in course of consumption—in such a society the accumulation of masses of belongings which can be handed down to posterity will be impossible. The abolition of the right of inheritance may be of great importance during the transition period as a means for doing away with capitalist and proprietary relations. All such measures are, of course, merely provisional expedients, but the consequences may be disastrous to the existence of private property. Even within the framework of the bourgeois social order, the imposition of a graduated tax upon inherited property and the prohibition of the right to bequeath property to collateral relatives, might prove adequate sources of State revenue.

During the epoch of the First International, Bakunin was the principal advocate of schemes to abolish the right of inheritance. For him this was a basic demand. The General Council, for which Marx acted as spokesman, declared that the right of inheritance was not a productive category, that the laws of inheritance did not constitute a cause but were an effect, a legal reflexion, of the prevailing economic organisation of society, that by converting the means of production into socially owned property we should once for all render laws relating to inheritance superfluous. The aim should be, then, to abolish those institutions which endowed certain individuals with power to exploit others. The abolition or the curtailment of the rights of inheritance might act as the starting-point for social reform. Such an invasion of the domain of property rights and inheritance rights would be expedient during the transition period, on the one hand, when the old economic foundations had not been completely swept away, and on the other hand, when the working class was already in such a position as to be able to intro-

duce changes in legal relations. Among the measures for the transition period we may, therefore, include the raising of the tax on inherited property and a curtailment of the right of bequest.

The fourth demand, the confiscation of the property of all emigres and rebels, a legacy from the practical experience of the great French revolution, is already to be met with in the precepts and instructions of Babeuf (1760-1797), the noted forerunner of modern communism. It found a place in the programs of the revolutionary societies that existed during the thirties and forties of the last century.

The fifth demand recalls one of the leading proposals of the Saint-Simonians. The champions of this doctrine always stressed the importance of banks and credit institutions. Still, there is really no more than a formal resemblance between the demand voiced in the Manifesto and that put forward by the Saint-Simonians. Marx, who had in 1847 unmercifully criticised Proudhon's ideas concerning gratuitous credit and people's banks, had still less tolerance of the credit and banking illusions of the Saint-Simonians. Just as the people's banks of Proudhon would have been powerless to do away with the laws governing the production of commodities, just so little would the centralised bank of the Saint-Simonians have proved capable of regulating production in such a way as to avert recurrent crises. In both cases alike, the maintenance of private property in the means of production would have left the laws of capitalist society intact.

But though the national bank which centralises credit is incapable of regulating the whole movement of national production—a function assigned to the national bank by Pecqueur (1801-1887)—nevertheless it can play a most important part during the transition period by helping to place the entire system of national credit under the control of the proletarian State.

Centralisation of the means of transport in the hands of the State, the sixth demand voiced in the Manifesto, is the logical outcome of demands 1 and 5. Even when the railways were not constructed by the State, but by some private company, these railway companies became wealthy at the expense of the State, which had granted credits and subsidies. In the United States, the railways companies were assigned large blocks of land along the railways, and thus became the biggest landowners in the States. Pecqueur devoted a book to the study of the question of railways, and already at the date of his writing (1840) he formulated a special program of demands which coincides almost word

for word with what Marx Engels put forward in their program for Germany.

The "national factories" referred to in the seventh demand must not be confused with the "national workshops" of Louis Blanc (1811-1882), the French socialist, historian, and statesman who was a member of the Provisional Government in 1848. In the Manifesto we have to do, not with the organisation of co-operative production backed up with State aid, but with the nationalisation of private enterprises, the conversion of such enterprises into State or national enterprises. So far as Louis Blanc was concerned, national workshops were to be a realisation of the *right* to work; but the communists look upon the introduction of State factories as the realisation of the *obligation* of every able-bodied person to work. The latter idea already found expression in Babeuf's decrees, and is referred to explicitly in the eighth demand of the Manifesto. It is intimately connected with another demand voiced by such writers as Weitling (1808-1871), the German communists, and Dezamy (died 1850), a member of French communist circles. Charles Fourier (1772-1837) was, however, the first to formulate the demand for the inauguration of an army of labour. The main task of this army of labour as hinted in the Manifesto, was the cultivation and improvement of the land according to a pre-conceived plan, another of Fourier's pet schemes.

We have already learned how great an importance Marx attached to the division of labour both in society and in the workshop, and to what extent the division between town and countryside influenced the course of history. Hence the introduction of the ninth demand, *i.e.*, that agricultural and urban industry shall work hand-in-hand, so as by degrees to obliterate the distinction between town and country.

"The utopists were already well aware of the effects of the division of labour. They knew how labour itself undergoes a sort of atrophy, how the working capacity becomes restricted, when the worker is limited to the life-long task of mechanically repeating the same monotonous act. Fourier and Owen are agreed in demanding the abolition of the contrast between town and country as the first requisite for the abolition of the old kind of division of labour. Both of them considered that the population ought to be distributed over the countryside in groups ranging from sixteen hundred to three thousand in number. The members of each of these groups were to live at the centre of the region of land they tilled, leading a communal existence there. Now and

again Fourier speaks of towns; but these towns were merely to be aggregates of four or five adjacent groups. Alike in Fourier's scheme and in Owen's, every member of the community was to be engaged both in agricultural and in manufacturing occupations. But whereas, as regards these latter, Fourier laid the main stress upon handicraft and upon manufacture in the primitive sense of that term, Owen already envisaged large-scale industry and looked for the introduction of steam-power and machinery in domestic economy. Whether in agriculture or in manufacturing industry, both Fourier and Owen favoured the utmost possible variety of occupation for the individual worker, demanding, as a preliminary to this, that young people should receive a highly diversified technical training. . . . Thus the abolition of the contrast between town and country is not merely possible, but essential. It has become necessary alike for manufacturing industry, or agricultural production, and for the fulfilment of the demands of hygiene. Only through an amalgamation of town and country will it be possible to put an end to the current poisoning of air, water, and soil; only in this will it be possible to arrange for the masses who are now crowded in pestilential towns that their excreta shall be turned to useful account as manure instead of generating disease The abolition of the severance between town and country is, therefore, not a utopian proposal. On the contrary, it aims at the most uniform distribution of large-scale industry throughout the country. It is true that the extant great towns, one of the legacies of civilisation, can only be done away with at a great expenditure of time and trouble. But do away with them we must, though the process be tedious and laborious." (Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, pp. 277-282.)

In the tenth demand we find expressed the need for wiping out the evil consequences of the separation of mental and physical labour. Universal, gratuitous education was already advocated by Babeuf and his companions. All the great utopists stressed the need for it. According to Owen and Fourier, education was to consist of a many-sided technical training of youth, so that a many-sided development of capacities might take place and restore to labour the charms which had been lost through the division of labour.

A resolution passed by the Geneva Congress of the International Workingmen's Association in 1866 contained a fairly detailed elucidation of this idea of combining manual with mental work. The resolution was composed by Marx and ran as follows: "By education

we understand three things. First: mental education. Secondly: bodily education, such as is given in schools of gymnastics, and by military drill. Thirdly: technological training, which imparts the general principles of all processes of production, and simultaneously initiates the child and young person into the practical use and handling of the elementary instruments of all trades. A gradual and progressive course of mental, gymnastic, and technological training ought to correspond to the classification of the young workers. The costs of the technological schools ought to be partly met by the sale of their products. The combination of paid productive labour, mental education, bodily exercise, and polytechnic training, will raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle classes."

To recapitulate: the program as stated in the Manifesto is an international program, one intended to apply to all the more advanced countries; and yet the communists in the various lands are free to add such demands as are specially applicable within the national frontiers, and, above all, such as will most effectively break the power of the native bourgeoisie. As an example, we may remind the reader of the program adopted by the German communists immediately after the disturbances of 1848, and within a couple of weeks after the publication of the Manifesto (see Appendix, "Demands of the Communist Party in Germany."). This program, written by Marx and Engels, differs in several points from the program outlined in the Manifesto. We shall return to the matter when dealing with the last chapter of the Manifesto (see below, notes 62.)

47. CENTRALISATION AND THE STATE.

IN the preface to the German edition of 1872, Marx and Engels declared that in some respects the Manifesto was out of date. They pointed in especial to the parts dealing with the attitude of the revolutionary workers towards the bourgeois State apparatus. Intimately bound up with this question was that of their attitude towards political centralisation, a matter upon which Marx and Engels had modified their outlook since the early fifties.

The tactics advocated in the Manifesto were based upon the study of what happened during the great French revolution, upon the notion that the seizure of political power by the proletariat would be effected along lines suggested by the analogy of the days of the Convention.

That was why they set so much store upon the centralised political apparatus, which, in their view, had been the invention of the Jacobins. The conquest of this apparatus would simplify the work of revolutionary victory in every land. Hence, during the days preceding the revolution of 1848, during the progress of that revolution, and during the years that immediately succeeded it, both Marx and Engels passionately attacked any movement towards federalism or decentralisation on the part of the German or the French democrats.

"Either the democrats will directly aim at the establishment of a federal republic; or else (if they find it impossible to avoid setting up a one and indivisible republic) they will try to paralyse the central government by giving the largest possible measure of independence to the local authorities. The workers, for their part, must try to counteract these plans, not only by doing all that they can to promote the establishment of a one and indivisible German republic, but also by seeing to it that, in this republic, authority shall be strongly centralised. They must not allow themselves to be fooled by democratic chatter concerning the freedom of the local authorities, concerning the value of local self-government, etc. In such a country as Germany, where so many survivals of medievalism still cumber the ground, and where all kinds of local arrogance and obstinacy still remain to be overcome, we must never dream of allowing every village, every town and every province to impose hindrances in the way of revolutionary activity—an activity which can only manifest itself in its full force when it issues from the centre of things. As in the France of 1793, so in the Germany of to-day [1850], the establishment of the most rigid centralisation must be one of the primary endeavours of a genuinely revolutionary party." (Marx, *Enthüllungen*, etc., pp. 135-136.)

This was written in March, 1850. By February, 1852, Marx had come to the conclusion that in France the various revolutions, far from smashing up, had perpetuated the administrative machine which had been devised under the old order. Here is what he writes in *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, (p. 131.): "To the parties competing for dominion, the occupation of this huge State edifice has become the most important of the spoils of victory."

He moots the question of destroying this machine on condition that centralisation shall be preserved. "The governmental centralisation indispensable to modern society can rise only upon the ruins of the

militarist and bureaucratic governmental machinery which was created as a counterblast to feudalism." (*Ibid*, p. 140.)

Marx emphasises the fact that the "French revolution, which aimed at sweeping away all particularist authorities (whether local, territorial, urban or provincial) in order to mould the nation into a bourgeois unity, could not fail to develop what the absolute monarchy had begun—centralisation. Therewith it could not fail to develop the range and the attributes of governmental authority . . . Napoleon perfected this State machinery." (*Ibid*, p. 131.)

Marx had not then realised the nature of this centralisation. It had been developed by the Convention and depended upon the Jacobin organisations for support. This centralisation was an expression of the indissoluble sovereignty of the revolutionary people, it was the recognition of the central power of the State, while allowing for self-government in the departments, communes, districts, and so forth, *i.e.*, local self-government.

A profounder study of social and political institutions, undertaken during the eighteen-fifties, caused Marx and Engels to change their outlooks. Not only did they come to hold other views concerning the communal ownership of land, but likewise concerning political centralisation and the forms in which such centralisation was to be realised. In 1885 Engels wrote:

"Every one knows nowadays that throughout the revolution and down to the Eighteenth Brumaire the government of the departments, the districts, and the communes was carried on by locally elected authorities, which had free scope of action within the general limits of national legislation. Every one knows, moreover, that these local authorities, the embodiments of a system resembling that of provincial and local self-government in the United States of America, were among the main factors of the revolution. That was why Napoleon, immediately after the coup d'état of the Eighteenth Brumaire [November 9, 1799], hastened to abolish the extant system and to replace it by the prefectural system which still remains in force, and was a reactionary instrument from the very start. But just as little as local and provincial self-government is incompatible with national centralisation, just so little is local and provincial self-government necessarily associated with that narrow, cantonal, and communal self-seeking that forms so repulsive a feature of Swiss political life—of the system which in 1849, all the South German federal republicans wished

to take as a model for Germany." (*Enthüllungen*, etc., p. 136, footnote.)

The experience of the Paris Commune had convinced Marx and Engels once and for all that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." The first thing the communards should have done was to smash up the leading organs of the bourgeois State: to abolish such institutions, for instance, as the standing army, and to replace it by "the nation in arms"; to convert the police into a responsible tool of the Commune, liable to recall, and deprived of any kind of political function; to clear out the bureaucracy, so that high office under the State should have ceased to be the privilege of a possessing class and should have been transformed into social service, paid for at an ordinary rate of wages, and carried out by elected individuals liable to recall.

The Commune should not merely have assumed parliamentary functions, but should have become a working corporation combining both the executive and legislative powers. The old centralised organisation should have yielded place to self-governing bodies in the provincial districts likewise. The unity of the nation, far from being in any way tampered with by such institutions, would have been strengthened by communal organisation of this type; unity would, indeed, have become a tangible fact, thanks to the abolition of the bourgeois State power which only masquerades as the fulfilment of that unity. For the old-time State wished to be superior to the national unity, wished to be completely independent of it, although in reality it was a parasitic growth upon the body of the nation. The true importance of the Commune consists in this, that it was a government of the working class, a government which rose to power as the outcome of the struggle between the exploited class and the governing class. The struggle assumed a political form, by means of which the economic emancipation of labour could have been accomplished. The Commune should have served as a crowbar getting a pry on the foundations of extant society and toppling it over together with all the economic institutions which made it possible for a possessing class to be the ruling class. This crowbar, this lever, would have been constituted by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But the dictatorship of the proletariat will be no more than a temporary phenomenon. It will be necessary during the transition period, while the capitalist form of society is being changed into a

communist society, while capitalist institutions are being replaced by revolutionary institutions, while antagonisms are being done away with, and the class State is becoming a thing of the past. By destroying the economic foundations upon which the capitalist edifice is upbuilt and upon which the integrity of the class State depends, the dictatorship of the proletariat puts an end to the final form of State power, transforming the State into a mere organ for the administration of production.

The latter idea, already found in the writings of the Saint-Simonians, has become the universal heritage of the communist movement. Marx brought something new into the theory of his predecessors. He showed that the class war, as it is waged under the conditions of capitalist production, must lead to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that the dictatorship is merely a transitional phenomenon, a necessary stage on the way to the abolition of class distinctions and the inauguration of a classless society.

"In the course of its development, the working class will replace the old bourgeois society by an association which will know nothing of classes and class conflicts. Then there will no longer be any political power, in the strict sense of the term, seeing that political power is the official expression of the conflicts within bourgeois society." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 137.)

The anarchists, who have never been able to grasp the nature of this process, who have never had an inkling of why dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable during the transition period, would like to turn the whole process topsy-turvy, and to start off with the destruction of any kind of State power.

Prior to the revolution of 1848, the theories of anarchism could not be voiced in a program issued by a special party, because no such party as yet existed. In the writings of the forerunners of anarchism, the main foundations of the doctrine were to be met with in the economic field. It was not until the eighteen-sixties, during the lifetime of the International Workingmen's Association, that anarchism became an ordered system of philosophy, conducting a war against God and the State. The leader of this movement was Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876).

Hence, in the Manifesto, Marx and Engels formulated views (which have now become the common heritage of all socialists and

communists), whose distinctive characteristic is that a communist society is one wherein there exists no State.

The dispute with Bakunin and the Swiss anarchists, and later with Duhring, gave Marx and Engels an opportunity of emphasising the difference between their outlooks and those of the anarchists as to the part played by the State, and as to the best means for attacking the State.

“Class antagonisms, which lie at the root of all societies past and present, made the setting up of a State power inevitable. By the State is meant the organisation of the exploiting class for the maintenance of the extant material conditions of production, and more especially for the forcible subjugation of the exploited class, for the keeping of it within the conditions of oppression characteristic of the extant method of production (slavery, serfdom, or wage labour, as the case may be). The State was the official representative of society at large, its embodiment into a visible corporation; but it was this only inasmuch as it was the State of that particular class which, during that particular epoch, was able for practical purposes to represent society at large: in the days of classical antiquity, the State of the slave-owners; in the Middle Ages, the State of the feudal nobility; in our own time, the State of the bourgeoisie. In so far as, at long last, the State becomes truly representative of society at large, it renders itself superfluous. As soon as there is no longer any social class which has to be kept in subjection, as soon as class dominion has been abolished and therewith an end been made to the struggle for existence, and the consequent collisions and excesses arising out of the extant anarchy of production, there will be nothing left to repress, and therefore nothing which will necessitate the existence of a special repressive authority, a State. The first action undertaken by the State as genuinely representative of society at large, the seizure of the means of production in the name of society at large, is simultaneously its last independent action as a State. In one domain after another, the intervention of a State authority in social relations becomes superfluous, and therefore spontaneously ceases to occur. The Government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and by the management of the processes of production. The State is not ‘abolished,’ it dies out. These considerations enlighten us as to the worth of the phrase ‘a free people’s State,’ showing us that, while it has a temporary value for propaganda purposes, it has no ultimate scientific adequacy. The same considerations give us a

standard by which we can appraise the demand of the so-called anarchists, who want to make an end of the State betwixt night and morning." (Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, pp. 266-267.)

III.

SOCIALIST AND COMMUNIST LITERATURE

48. REACTIONARY ROMANTICISM

THE reference here is to the more important representatives of the reaction against the French revolution. The antagonists came from the ranks of the feudal aristocracy and it was against these gentry that the keenest shafts of the Jacobins were aimed. Among French men of letters, this reaction was voiced by such writers as Louis de Bonald (1754-1840), and Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821), who contemplated the possibility of restoring the old order with its three main buttresses, God, King, and Executioner. Bonald fiercely opposed any innovations. Everything which was given birth to by the new industry, everything which called to mind the "principles of the eighteenth century" was condemned out of hand. Large towns, credit, banking—all these were contraptions of the devil. Especially offensive to Bonald were the successes of industry and technique, which he rightly regarded as phenomena that were quite incompatible with a primitive social order, with patriarchal rights, and (speaking generally), with a spirit of medieval isolation and exclusiveness. In the normal State, he considered, the interests of the landowning class take the first place, seeing that this class is more stable than all others and more devoted to order and tranquillity. On the other hand, the predominance of commerce, industry, and capitalism introduces into the nation an unstable "revolutionary factor," undermines the time-honoured system of social stratification, leads to the subverting of social relationships, and to the infringement of rights. Of coal, Bonald says, with tears in his eyes: "It fills the air with smoke, makes a horrible smell, diffuses low spirits, and can, in the course of time, change the whole character of a nation."

When, in the Manifesto, Marx and Engels depict the revolutionary part played by the bourgeoisie in its fight against feudalism, when they

speak of the way in which the rise of the modern industrial system has led to the scrapping of the idyllic conditions of medieval society, they have in mind the lamentations and anathemas pronounced against the new order by the champions of the Catholic and feudal order of society which existed in the Middle Ages. In addition to Bonald and de Maistre, we may mention in this connection the literary outpourings of Chateaubriand (1768-1848) in France, of Adam Müller (1779-1829) in Germany, of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) and Robert Southey (1774-1843) in England. One and all these writers accuse large-scale industry of having destroyed the old patriarchal conditions wherein everything stood in its prescribed place, wherein the feudal sheep when called upon by baron or by priest would meekly and reverently allow themselves to be fleeced to the greater glory of throne and church.

In a later edition of the Manifesto, Engels introduced a note to the words "Restoration period" which appear in this same paragraph. He thought it expedient to explain that the words referred, not to the English Restoration period from 1660 to 1689, but to the French Restoration from 1814 to 1830.

49. FEUDALISTIC SOCIALISM

ENGELS added a note here in later editions. He draws our attention to the fact that these strictures on the feudalists apply, "in especial, to Germany where the landed aristocracy and the squirearchy have large areas of their estates managed for them and cultivated by bailiffs; moreover, these gentry possess, in addition, extensive beet-sugar factories, and stills for the making of potato spirit. The wealthier members of the British aristocracy are, at present, rather above such methods. Nevertheless, they compensate themselves for declining rents by lending their names to the promoters of more or less shady joint-stock companies."

Marx and Engels select two organisations from among those which best represent the theories of feudalistic socialism, "some of the French legitimists and the members of the Young England group."

Charles Andler, in his commentary *Le manifeste communiste* (Bibliothèque Socialiste, pp. 170 *et seq.*) cites a few names in this connection. But his choice is rather happy-go-lucky and lacks foundation. We have to do here with the legitimists who, in contradistinction

to their colleagues, endeavoured to win the sympathies of the "common people" by indicting the shopkeepers and manufacturers of the July monarchy, at the head of whom was the king, Louis Philippe (1773-1850)—that shopkeeper of shopkeepers. The antics of these legitimists posing as leaders of the people were deliciously taken off by Heinrich Heine, the German poet and journalist who was born about 1800 and died in 1856. He writes: "It is amusing beyond words to hear these masked priests vociferating in the language of the sansculottes, to watch the coquettish air of savagery with which they sport the red caps of the Jacobins, to note how at times they are seized with a panic lest in a fit of absent-mindedness they should have donned the bishop's red cap instead. When this happens, they will remove the borrowed headgear for a moment, to make sure, and everyone can see the tonsure it was hiding."

The agitation for throne and altar, which was now carried on in aid of the poor, was the most characteristic feature of this government. Lamennais (1782-1854), the French philosopher and theologian, was among the pioneers of the movement and continued actively to support it until his breach with the Church. But the outstanding figure was undoubtedly the Comte de Montalembert (1810-1870), publicist and politician, and one of the most brilliant protagonists of liberal Catholicism. In company with Villeneuve-Bargemont (1784-1850) he came forward as the champion of the workers in industry.

While the bill for protection of children was under discussion, Montalembert thundered against the bourgeois social order, attacking the cotton manufacturers who forced the poor man, together, with wife and child, into the factory, thus breaking up the home, tearing people away from the benefits of rural life and flinging them into unwholesome barracks, latter-day dungeons, where persons of very various ages and of different sexes were condemned to slow but systematic degradation.

In his *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 95, Marx recommends Proudhon to study the works of Monsieur de Villeneuve-Bargemont and to adopt him as mentor in matters concerning political economy, for this writer, too, runs after providential aims, in that his goal is not equality, but Catholicism. Indeed, that economist, who combined the political doctrines of Bonald with the economic criticism of Sismondi (1773-1842) concocted a complete system of legitimist and Christian economics. Liberal political economists were strongly opposed to any "interference in the relations between master and man in the factory."

But Villeneuve-Bargemont proposed a whole series of measures to be taken in the field of labour legislation: prohibition of child labour, sanitary inspection, obligatory technical training of factory workers, the inauguration of savings banks, etc., etc. In due course, however, all these groups became merged into the trend known as Catholic socialism. Now the hope was that the natural leaders of the suffering masses would be found, not among the feudal aristocrats, but among the lords of large-scale industry.

In his book *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*, Engels speaks in kindly terms of the members of the organisation known as Young England. Explaining why he cannot enter in detail into a discussion of the differences between various sections of the bourgeoisie, he nevertheless speaks of "honourable exceptions." Among these were the philanthropic Tories who had recently organised themselves as "Young England." They included certain members of parliament, such as Disraeli (1804-1881), Borthwick (1804-1852), Ferrand (1829-1870), Lord John Manners (1818-1906), etc. Lord Ashley (afterwards Lord Shaftesbury, 1801-1885) was intimately associated with Manners. The aim of Young England was to restore the conditions which had existed in "Merry England" with all its splendours and its romantic trappings of feudalism. Such an absurd and impossible aim could be nothing more than a satire upon the true course of historical development. Still, we need must recognise the good intentions and the manliness of those members of Young England who rose in protest against the social order of their day, against current prejudice, and who realised the base character of the extant order of society. (Summarised from a footnote to p. 295 of *Lage*, etc.; English translation, p. 293).

Young England attracted to its ranks the youthful sprigs of the British and Irish aristocracy, among whom George Smythe (subsequently Viscount Strangford, 1789-1846) was the leading spirit. They strongly opposed industrial capitalism and free trade, and dreamed of reinstating the political supremacy of the aristocracy, a supremacy whose roots should be deeply set into the social structure, and should be broad-based upon democratic foundations.

Disraeli (afterwards Lord Beaconsfield), son of wealthy Jewish parents, was closely associated with this group. As early as 1839 he began to attract attention by his speeches relating to the Chartist petition; he came forward in defence of the Chartists, in spite of the

fact that he was not in agreement with the movement. In his novels, *Coningsby* for instance, and especially in *Sybil or The Two Nations*, he gave a popular exposition of the socialistic ideas of the Tories. In *Sybil* (see above, note 29) he drew a sympathetic picture of the Chartist movement, and gave a vivid portrait of contemporary England which, under the influence of large-scale industrial production, was splitting up into "two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each others' habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones or inhabitants of different planets." (*Sybil*, Book II, Chap. IV.)

As a political group, Young England was beginning to peter out as early as 1845. Disraeli soon after was to cast in his lot with the true-blue Tories, and subsequently became the leader of British conservatism.

Borthwick, Ferrand (whose speech in defence of the workers is thrice quoted by Marx in *Capital*—I, pp. 271, 444, and 631), and Lord Ashley played an important part in the history of British factory legislation. Lord Ashley, although he gave general support to the conservatives, modified his parliamentary conduct in consequence of his interest in the improvement of the conditions of the workers, so that during his lifetime his name became a household word. He was an expert in the matter of profits in industry, and his statistics were of enormous value to the Chartists and the free traders in their slashing attacks on those Christian hypocrites who, while denouncing the vices of others, closed their eyes to the same vices when these happened to contribute to their own welfare.

Lord Ashley, better known under his later title of Lord Shaftesbury, was the leader of the aristocratic philanthropists who waged war upon the factory system. During the years 1844 and 1845, his personality constituted the favourite theme of attack in the columns of the most important liberal organ of the day, the "Morning Chronicle," when that periodical was revealing the terrible conditions prevalent among the agricultural workers. The tables published by Marx (*Capital*, I, 748) show how low were the wages received by the workers on the honourable and humane lord's estates. Nor did our worthy lord refrain from pocketing a large proportion of these wages in the form of house-rent (*Ibid.*, p. 749.)

It behoves us to mention yet another representative of feudalistic socialism, the great historian and man of letters, Thomas Carlyle

(1795-1881). Engels was even more lenient to him than he was to the Young England party. "Thomas Carlyle stands in a category apart. At the outset he was a tory, but subsequently he far outstripped his fellow tories. He, more than any other British bourgeois, understands the prevailing social anarchy and demands the organisation of labour. I hope that Carlyle once he has entered the right path, may be able to follow it to the end. Like so many other Germans, I wish him Godspeed." (*Lage*, etc., *loc. cit.*)

In 1892 Engels amplified this reference to Carlyle as follows: "The February revolution transformed Carlyle into a thoroughgoing reactionary. His righteous indignation against the philistines was converted into a sour and philistine peevishness against the historical tidal wave which washed him ashore and left him marooned."

Carlyle's book, *Past and Present* (1843), was, together with his *Chartism* (1839), the finest thing that had been written from the aristocratic socialist point of view on the situation of the British workers. In the "Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher" (1844) is an article by Engels entitled *Die Lage Englands*, a detailed and sympathetic review of Carlyle's *Past and Present*.

Both these works from Carlyle's pen produced a profound impression on Engels. This may account for the preference he gives to the tories as against the whigs. In the before-mentioned article he writes: "In the social conditions now prevailing in England, self-interest makes it impossible for the whigs to pass an adverse judgment on industry, which is the pivot of English society, is in the hands of the whigs, and is enriching them. Industry seems to them irreproachable, the spread of industry is the whole object of their legislation. Why? Because industry has brought them wealth and power. On the other hand, the tories—whose power and autocracy were destroyed by industry, whose principles were shaken by industry—hate industry and, at best, look upon it as a necessary evil. That was why there came into being philanthropic tories, whose leaders were Lord Ashley, Ferrand, Walter, Oastler, etc., who made it their duty to champion the interests of the workers against the factory owners. Carlyle was a tory in the beginning, and remained throughout life more sympathetic towards this party than he was towards the whigs." (*Nachlass*, Vol. I, p. 464.)

The remarkable analogy between the condition of the English serfs in 1145 and the condition of the English workers in 1845—a

parallel which Engels draws in his book *The Condition of the Working Class in England*—had already been pointed out by Carlyle. From Carlyle, likewise, comes the idea of “the nexus of cash payments,” the monetary calculations on which bourgeois autocracy is based. Carlyle’s words on these matters are echoed in the Manifesto. For Carlyle had protested against the Mammon worship of his day, and had even looked to the “organisation of labour” (from above, by “heroes” of course) for help.

But as early as 1844, Engels declared that Carlyle could not shake off his religious outlook on the universe, that his pantheism was nothing more than a worship of mankind as such. “Hence his demand for a ‘genuine’ aristocracy, for ‘heroes’, as if these ‘heroes’ could be anything more than men. Had he grasped the nature of man, as man in all his infinitude, Carlyle would never have thought of dividing humanity into sheep and goats, rulers and ruled, aristocrats and canaille, gentlemen and fools; he would have considered that talent will find its true social position, not in the exercise of forcible dominion, but in incitement and leadership. Certainly, democracy is no more than a transitional phase. Yet it does not lead to the establishment of a new improved aristocracy, but to the establishment of a genuine human freedom; just as the irreligion of our epoch will ultimately lead, not to the re-establishment of religion, but to complete emancipation from religion in all its forms, from the super-human and the supernatural. Carlyle recognises the inadequacy of ‘competition, supply and demand, mammonism,’ etc., and he is far from being inclined to maintain that there is an absolute justification for landed proprietorship. Why, then, does not he draw the obvious conclusion from his own premises, and reject private ownership in general? Why should he want to destroy ‘competition, supply and demand, mammonism,’ etc., while he leaves private property, which is the root of all these things, intact? The ‘organisation of labour’ cannot help him, for it can only be effected if there is a certain measure of community of interests.” (*Nachlass*, Vol. I, pp. 488-489.)

In the columns of the “*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*,” during the year 1850, we find a more definite repudiation of Carlyle, who had become thoroughly reactionary in consequence of the events of 1848. His earlier services are acknowledged. “We have to thank Thomas Carlyle for this, that as a man of letters he took up the cudgels against the bourgeoisie at a time when bourgeois views, tastes, and ideas held

unchallenged sway in the British literary world; and that he did so in a manner which at times deserves the name of revolutionary. This remark applies to much of what he writes in the *French Revolution*, in *Cromwell*, in *Chartism*, and in *Past and Present*. But in all these works the author's criticism of extant conditions is intimately associated with a strangely unhistorical apotheosis of the Middle Ages, such as is common in the writings of English revolutionists—Cobbett, for instance, and some of the Chartists. Whereas he admires the past as comprising, at least, the classical epochs of a definite social phase, the present reduces him to despair, and the prospect of the future fills him with horror. When he pays homage to the revolution, and even glorifies it, he does this in so far as for him the revolution becomes concentrated in the personality of an individual, of a Cromwell or a Danton. He makes a cult of them as heroes, the cult which, in his *Lectures on Heroes and Hero Worship*, he has advocated as the only refuge from a present gravid with despair, and has preached as a new religion." (*Nachlass*, Vol. III, pp. 414-415.)

In his later works, Carlyle showed that he had quite forsaken the revolutionary camp. "Carlyle, like Strauss, has devoted himself to a cult of genius. In the works now under review, the genius has evaporated, but the cult remains." (*Nachlass*, Vol. III, p. 415.) During the American Civil War, one which was waged to decide the issue raised by those who wished to see slave-holding abolished, he championed the slave-holders, just as, subsequently, in 1865, he rallied to the defence of Edward John Eyre (1815-1891), governor of Jamaica who, when a negro revolt broke out, had repressed it with great severity. "Thus," writes Marx in this connection, "burst the splendid bubble of tory sympathy with the wage workers; of sympathy with the urban workers, be it noted, and by no means with those of the countryside. The kernel proved to be—Slavery."

• 50. CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

CHRISTIAN socialism is closely related to feudalistic socialism. In the writings of all the spokesmen of the reaction against the French revolution, we find the cult of monarchy wedded to the cult of the Church. But whereas the prestige of the old-time absolute monarchy had vanished into the inane, and whereas the July monarchy was compromising itself more and more as the days went by, among the men whose philanthropic sentiments were genuine a new trend was

beginning to manifest itself. This new form of socialism aimed at reconciling religion with the Church, making the latter more democratic, turning it back into the paths of primitive Christianity. Lamennais was undoubtedly the most gifted representative of this school of thought. In 1837, his book *Paroles d'un croyant* was published. This brought about a breach between the author and the old ecclesiastical traditions, and severed his ties with the legitimists. Lamennais was a sincere democrat, a passionate defender of the working folk, and he painted in vivid colours the grievous situation of those who toiled. Like a prophet of old, he scourged the new rich of his epoch and spared them not. As a means for curing poverty, he recommended free association and other measures to guarantee at least a minimum subsistence to the poor. His influence spread beyond the borders of his native land, and as soon as his book was translated it became, as it were, a new evangel among the craftsmen in German-speaking countries.

Another important representative of Christian socialism was Philippe Buchez (1796-1865), the French author and politician. At the outset, he joined the Saint-Simonians, but after a while he broke away from them, and began to elaborate his system of socialism. Herein he maintained that the Christian religion and Christian ethics were the main factors of progress. He attacked the communists, and brought forward a scheme for the establishment of productive associations, which were to be specially adapted to the needs of craftsmen. Buchez made common cause with the group of Parisian workers which ran "Le Producteur" and "Le National." Engels, who never missed an opportunity for getting into contract with working-class organisations, endeavoured, during his sojourn in Paris, to keep in touch with the "Producteur" group, and an article from his pen was published in its columns.

It was not until after the triumph of the reaction in 1848, however, that the most favourable conditions for the growth of Christian socialism were established. Then we get many different combinations of socialism with various religious designations: Catholic socialism, Protestant socialism, Anglican socialism, Christian socialism, etc. At the date of the publication of the Manifesto, these religious forms of socialism attracted only a very scanty portion of the proletariat.

As in the Manifesto, so elsewhere, Marx resisted every effort to

Christinise socialism, to introduce Christian morals into the socialist theories which were assuming an international character. He adopted a more than usually decisive tone in his polemic against an article which had found its way into the "Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung." The author of the offending article, Hermann Wagener (1815-1889) by name, was one of the leading exponents of conservative and Christian socialism in Germany, of the trend which did not secure administrative expression until considerably later, after the establishment of the empire. The endeavour to show that communism was an expression of the social theories underlying Christianity was countered by Marx in the following lines, which elucidate the part played by these theories in the course of historical evolution.

"The social principles of Christianity have had eighteen centuries in which to develop, and have no need to undergo further development at the hands of Prussian consistorial councillors. The social principles of Christianity justified the slavery of classical days; they glorified medieval serfdom; and they are able when needs must to defend the oppression of the proletariat, though with a somewhat crestfallen air. The social principles of Christianity proclaim the need for the existence of a ruling class and a subjugated class, being content to express the pious hope that the former will deal philanthropically with the latter. The social principles of Christianity assume that there will be compensation in heaven for all the infamies committed on earth, and thereby justify the persistence of these infamies here below. The social principles of Christianity explain that the atrocities perpetrated by the oppressors on the oppressed are either just punishments for original and other sins, or else trials which the Lord in his wisdom ordains for the redeemed. The social principles of Christianity preach cowardice, self-contempt, abasement, submission, humility, in a word, all the qualities of the canaille; and the proletariat, which will not allow itself to be treated as canaille, needs courage, self-confidence, pride, a sense of personal dignity and independence, even more than it needs daily bread. The social principles of Christianity are lick-spittle, whereas the proletariat is revolutionary. So much for the social principles of Christianity!" (*Nachlass*, Vol. II, pp. 442-443.)

It would, of course, not be difficult to show that these "social principles of Christianity" have not always played a reactionary role. Primitive Christianity, in so far as it was a protest against the ancient

world order, stood for the abolition of private property and the State, and advocated asceticism and poverty. But this is a very old story, belonging to a time when no other means of freeing those that "labour and are heavy laden" existed apart from the help proffered by the "heavenly Jerusalem"! The workers must resist every endeavour to reconcile them to religion, no matter the guise in which the pabulum is presented: whether it is called "purified" or "ennobled" Christianity, or "new" Christianity, or the "religion of humanity."

"The fact is that religion is the self-consciousness and the self-feeling of the man who has either not yet found himself or, having done so, has lost himself again. . . . Thus the struggle against religion is a direct struggle against the world whose spiritual aroma is religion. Religious poverty is in one, the expression of real poverty; and, in another, a protest against real poverty. Religion is the sigh of a heavy laden creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is a prerequisite for the attainment of real happiness by the people. . . . Thus the criticism of heaven is transformed into a criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into a criticism of law, the criticism of theology into a criticism of politics." (Marx-Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. I, pp. 607-608. Marx, *Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie*.)

Marx and Engels could not but be extremely antagonistic to any endeavour to stupefy the proletariat by any form of religion and thus to hinder the workers in their movement towards emancipation. That was why they called religion "the opium of the people."

51. SISMONDI

WE have become so much accustomed to speak of "petty-bourgeois socialism" when referring to various socialistic doctrines which are current even among the working classes, that in the section entitled "petty-bourgeois socialism" we are prone to detect a criticism of Proudhon and men of his type, rather than a censure of the bourgeois economist Sismondi (1773-1842). In his introduction to a later edition of the Manifesto, Engels explains in which sense he and Marx made use of the word socialism in that historic document. Socialism, in contradistinction to communism, was for them a movement among

the workers or among the bourgeois whose aim was to do away with poverty by means of various panaceas, all imaginable contraptions, a patching-up here and another there. For the authors of the Manifesto, socialism was the doctrine of those who championed different kinds of utopian systems which appealed—just as the former schemes appealed—to the “educated” classes, *i.e.*, to the bourgeoisie. Among the protagonists of this bourgeois socialism, Marx and Engels distinguished several groups. Sismondi seemed to them the embodiment of petty-bourgeois socialism because, in all his criticisms of capitalism, his standards were exclusively petty-bourgeois or petty-peasant. “Those who, like Sismondi, wish to return to a correct proportionality in production while maintaining the extant foundations of society are reactionary, for, if they are to be consistent, they must likewise endeavour to re-establish all the other conditions of the industry of earlier days.” (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 53-54.)

Nevertheless Marx held Sismondi in high esteem as a critic of the capitalist order, and this appreciation is not confined to the Manifesto. Marx’s bourgeois antagonists, who were bursting with eagerness to convict him of plagiarism, were always ready to assign to him this, that or the other economist or socialist of an earlier generation as his teacher. In his enumeration of the services of Sismondi, they could find evidence of the existence of a number of basic ideas which found a place in the Marxian system, but were not “original discoveries” of Marx or Engels. The fact was, of course, that, while the ideas in question had been expressed after a fashion before the days of Marx and Engels, yet as elaborated by them, these ideas acquired a profounder significance; and in the general system of Marxian thought, they found a place which showed them in a much clearer light, and disclosed their true bearing. In *A Critique of Political Economy*, and in all the volumes of *Capital*, Marx writes of Sismondi with great respect, and numbers him among the outstanding representatives of the classical school of political economy. He even considers Sismondi to be the first really powerful critic of that school. But Sismondi is fond of recommending that the State shall put a curb upon unrestrained production, and thus control the too rapid development of new discoveries in the field of technique. Charles Andler finds Marx and Engels too harsh in the criticisms they elaborate in the Manifesto, although Gide (born 1847) and Charles Rist (*Histoire des doctrines économiques depuis les physiocrates jusqu’à nos jours*, p. 223) on the whole agree with their strictures.

"Instead of trying to stimulate production, the government ought to moderate 'a blind zeal.' Addressing itself to men of science, it begs them to stop inventing; to bear in mind the economists' watchword of non-interference. . . . It has a secret sympathy for the old system of guilds and guild-masters. Even while it condemns the old system as opposed to the interests of production, it wonders whether it could not learn something from that system which would help it to limit the abuses of competition. The first aim, therefore, will be to re-establish wherever possible a union between labour and property. With this end in view, Sismondi advocates in the case of agriculture a return to what he calls patriarchal property, this meaning a multiplication of peasant proprietors. In industry he would like to see the return of the independent artisan."

Does not much of this coincide with what is written in the Manifesto? Here we read that the "last words" of the Sismondian theories are "the medieval guild system in manufacturing industry, and patriarchalism in agriculture."

Sismondi had a great influence upon the economic literature of his day, but he never founded a school of his own. His most noted disciple was Buret (1811-1842), the author of a book dealing with the condition of the working classes in England and in France (*Misere des classes laborieuses en France et en Angleterre*, 1842). Buret goes somewhat further than his teacher and recommends a series of reforms in the realm of social and labour legislation. Herein we feel the influence of the Saint-Simonians to be at work.

As far as Adolphe Blanqui (1798-1854, French economist, author of works on political economy and upon the working classes of France, brother of Auguste Blanqui 1805-1881, socialist and revolutionary, writer on economic and social questions), Francois Xavier Droz (1773-1850, a French writer on ethics and political science), and others, are concerned, Sismondi's influence seems to have been limited to the fact that they refused to adopt the cynically indifferent attitude towards the sufferings of the working class assumed by the protagonists of vulgar political economy. (Concerning the "vulgar economists" as contrasted with the "classical economists," see *Capital*, I., 55, footnote). The representatives of the humanitarian school of economics are thus characterised by Marx in his *Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 98): "In order to placate their consciences, they do

their best to cloak the real contrasts, while honestly deploring the poverty of the workers and the unbridled competition that goes on among the bourgeois. They advise the workers to be sober, to work diligently, and to have very few children; and they advise the bourgeois to temper their zeal for production. The whole theory of this school consists in drawing endless distinctions between theory and practice, between principles and results, between an idea and its application, between content and form, between the essence and the reality, between the right and the fact, between the good side and the bad." The members of no other school have talked so much about the application of ethics to political economy. The ethical school of political economy, which came into existence after the publication of the Manifesto, was a renewed expression of this sloppy sentimentalism.

• 52. "TRUE" SOCIALISM

As a note to the section on "German or True Socialism," Engels wrote: "The revolutionary storms of the year 1848 swept the whole paltry business into the dustbin, and had so damped the ardour of the champions of 'true' socialism that they did not proceed any farther along the socialist path. The chief representative of this trend was Herr Karl Grün" (1813-1887).

Up to a point, the severe criticism of German or "true" socialism, contained in this section of the Manifesto, is a self-criticism, not only of Marx's own philosophical development, but, to a far greater degree, of Engels.' The latter lived through, in his personal experience, all the phases which characterised the development of the German intelligentsia of his day. The more, in later years, he felt he had been swept off his feet by this philosophical reincarnation of socialism, the bitterer were his references to his former flame. Nowhere does this find more acute expression than in the following passage, which might well serve as a commentary on the indictment of "true" socialism we have just been reading.

"At length the Germans are beginning to spoil even the communist movement. As usually happens in such cases, the sluggards, the backward, are trying to hide the fact that they have overslept themselves, by talking contemptuously about their forerunners and by beating the philosophical big drum. Hardly has communism made its appearance in Germany, than it is seized upon

by a horde of speculative thinkers who fancy they have done wonders when they translate into the language of the Hegelian logic the propositions that have already become commonplaces in France and England, and when they trumpet this new wisdom as something utterly unprecedented, as the 'True German theory,' going on to sling mud at the 'false tactics,' at the 'ludicrous' socialist systems of the dull-witted English and French. This ever-ready German theory, which has had the infinite advantage of being able to sniff out a little of the Hegelian philosophy of history and of being ranged by some dry-as-dust Berlin professor or other in the system of the eternal categories, this theory of those who have perhaps fluttered the pages of Feuerbach, have glanced at some of the writings of the German communists, and have a nodding acquaintance with what Herr Stein has said about French socialism, this German theory of the worst possible kind, has already settled accounts with French socialism and communism (as presented by Herr Stein), has assigned it to a subordinate position, has 'got beyond' it, has 'merged' it into the 'higher evolutionary phase' of the ever-ready 'German theory.' Of course, it never occurs to these worthies to make themselves acquainted at first hand with the things that are to be thus 'merged'; to examine for themselves the writings of Fourier, Saint-Simon, Owen, and the French communists. The meagre extracts made by Herr Stein (1815-1890), suffice them. Content with these extracts, they are able to win a brilliant victory for German theory over the feeble warriors of the foreign world Although the absurd vanity of German theorists seems invulnerable, it behoves us to remind the Germans how much they have owed to the foreign world since the days when they began to take an interest in social problems. Amid all the pompous locutions which are now being proclaimed in German literature as the fundamental principles of true, pure, German communist and socialist theory, there is not as yet to be found even one idea which sprang to life on German soil. What the French and the English have been saying for ten, twenty, forty years, have been saying very well, most clearly, in carefully chosen words, has just made its way into Germany. For the last year or so, the Germans have learned fragments of these things, and are pattering them in their own Hegelian jargon. Some of the more brilliant German thinkers have actually rediscovered these truths for themselves at this late hour, and are having them printed as original discoveries—in much less happy and much more abstract phraseology. My own writings

are not exempt from this criticism! The only thing on which the Germans are entitled to plume themselves for originality is the lame, abstract, obscure, and oblique form in which they express the afore-said ideas. Furthermore, as befits those who above all are theorists, what they have thought deserving of attention in the writings of the French (of the English, our worthy Germans know almost nothing as yet) is, over and above principles of the widest generality, nothing more than the most theoretical matter of all, the systematised attempts to forecast the details of the society of the future. They have quietly ignored the better side, the criticism of extant society, the real foundation, the main task of all those who are concerned with the study of social problems That is why German 'absolute socialism' is so hopelessly jejune. A pinch of 'humanity,' as it is the fashion to call this quality nowadays; a pinch of 'realisation' of this humanity, which is really a monstrous abortion; a pinch of 'property,' taken at third or fourth hand from Proudhon; a pinch of 'sympathy' with the miseries of the proletariat; a pinch of the 'organisation of labour'; a pinch of this or that society for the 'uplift of the lower classes'; an unlimited amount of ignorance concerning political economy and the real nature of the society in which we live—these are the ingredients to be stirred well. To make matters worse, the whole thing is to be drained of the last drop of blood, to be deprived of the last vestige of activity and energy, by perfect freedom from bias, by 'absolute dispassionateness.' How ineffably tedious! Is it with this that we are to revolutionise Germany, to set the proletariat in motion, to make the masses think and act?" (*Nachlass*, II, 407-408.)

Thus we see that Engels does not shrink from including himself in the act of accusation. At one time he was on terms of great intimacy with Moses Hess (1812-1875), the principal exponent of German philosophical socialism. Indeed, his friendship with Hess was a closer one in those days than was his friendship with Marx.

Hess was a few years older than Engels and Marx, and began his career as a man of letters somewhat earlier than they. Before ever he became acquainted with Marx, Hess had published *Die heilige Geschichte der Menschheit* (1837), and *Die Europäische Triarchie* (1841). In these works Moses Hess elaborated his philosophy of the history of mankind, supplementing the philosophy of thought by the "philosophy of action."

In 1841 he threw in his lot with the Hegelians of the left, and

made Marx's acquaintance. The meeting produced a deep impression upon the older man.

In a letter to his friend, Berthold Auerbach (1812-1882, the eminent German author), dated from Cologne, September 2, 1841, Hess wrote: "You can rely on making the acquaintance of the greatest, I might even say, the only, living philosopher Marx is the name of my idol. He is quite young, not more than twenty-four, and he is destined to give the death-blow to the religion and the politics of the Middle Ages. He combines a profound philosophical earnestness with a biting wit. Try to imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine, and Hegel all rolled into one—not thrown helter-skelter into a heap, but truly united so as to make a unified whole—and you will get an idea of Marx's make-up."

(Reprinted in Carl Grunberg's *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus*, etc., 10th year, 2nd and 3rd Heft, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 411-412.)

Hess had a share in founding the "Rheinische Zeitung," and in his articles began to lean towards communism. He thus anticipated Marx. His first meeting with Engels took place in Cologne, in which town their acquaintance ripened into friendship. Hess it was who convinced Engels that communism was the logical outcome of Young Hegelian doctrines. For many years he and Engels collaborated on the staff of "Der Gesellschaftsspiegel," published at Elberfeld. In an editorial, we read: "Is it possible that the Prussian monarch has less sympathy with the misery of the poorest classes, than has the Chamber of Deputies or the king of the French for similar people in France? So many facts point the other way, and reflection makes us so firmly convinced of the contrary, that the political trend of the liberals has become to us not merely uncongenial, but positively repulsive." (*Nachlass*, vol. II., p. 352.)

Very soon, however, Engels freed himself from this heritage of philosophical socialism. Hess, too, came ever nearer to the acceptance of the new ideas promulgated by Marx. But he came along very much slower than Engels, and it was with difficulty that he threw off the old idealistic inheritance. In July, 1846, he wrote to Marx: "Just as, at the outset, it was necessary to link up communist aspirations with German ideology, so now we have to found our theories upon historical and economic premises, otherwise it will be impossible to come to terms

either with the 'socialists' or with opponents of every kind and variety." (*Nachlass*, vol. II., p. 371.)

In the embittered faction fights which dogged the steps of the Communist League, Hess (whose nature unfitted him for practical activities) rallied now to one group now to another. At the conference of the League, he definitely broke away from Engels and Marx. When the revolution convulsed Germany in 1848, he stayed abroad most of the time; after its suppression he joined the faction led by Willich (1810-1878) and Schapper (1813-1870). A few years later, he entirely forsook the revolutionary movement and became the first prophet of Zionism. When Lassalle (1825-1864) started his agitation, Hess rallied to his views; but, after Lassalle's death, Hess cut adrift from Lassalle's followers. Still, he became a supporter of the International Workingmen's Association, and entered the lists against Bakunin.

In so far as the severe criticism in the Manifesto refers to the representatives of the "true" socialism that was being preached at the time of its publication, the main object of attack was as already mentioned, Karl Grun. Mehring's comment in this connection is interesting. "Grun was a typical journalist, in the bad sense of the word, a man equally devoid of depth and seriousness, and cocksure in his judgments. These were so superficial, so utterly trivial, that, even when their phrasing made them for a moment seem acute, they served only to expose his inanity. Marx and Engels had good reason for regarding him as the most intolerable of the 'true' socialists."

Writing in the "Westfälische Dampfboot" a few months before the appearance of the Manifesto, Marx already refers to the spiritual relationship between Grun and Hess. He writes: "Matters which in Hess' writings are vaguely hinted at and mystically expressed . . . are developed by Herr Grun to the pitch of absurdity."

A few quotations from Grun's writings will suffice to show the theory and practice underlying "true" socialism. "He who invokes the name of Feuerbach, invokes at the same time all the work performed in the realm of philosophy from Francis Bacon [1561-1626] down to our own day; he discloses what philosophy in the last resort wishes to be and signifies and arrives at; man, as the final result of universal history. In this way we get more effectively, because more thoroughly to work, than by worrying our heads about wages, competition, the inadequacies of the constitution . . . We get Man; man freed from

religion, from ideas of death, from all that is foreign to him, from all practical necessities—pure, true man . . . ”

The following model of good reasoning perpetrated by Karl Grun, shows us why the writers of the Manifesto considered such literature to be of a highly enervating character: “Who in Prussia is demanding a constitution? The liberals. Who are these liberals? Gentlemen sitting at home in their mansions, and a handful of writers Does a handful of property owners and their scribes constitute the people? Certainly not. Does the people want a constitution? Not even in its dreams . . . If the Silesian proletariat were self-conscious, and if it had essential rights accordant with this self-consciousness, it would petition against a constitution. But the proletariat has neither self-consciousness nor rights, and therefore we act in its name. We protest.” (*Nachlass*, vol. II, pp. 359-360.)

Screeds in this vein merely served to bring grist to the mill of such hardened opponents of communism as the democrat and republican Karl Heinzen (1809-1880), who accused the communists of misunderstanding the significance of the “political factor” and in actual fact proving themselves to be “the servants of absolutism.”

In addition to the attack on the “true” socialists, the section under consideration also contains a criticism of German philosophy in so far as it manifests the influence of French revolutionary thought. At the head comes Kant (1724-1804), who declared that the demands of the French revolution were only the general demands of “practical reason.” Marx and Engels explain Kant’s outlook in this matter as due to peculiarities in the economic development of Germany, peculiarities which favoured the preservation of the petty bourgeoisie.

“The condition of Germany at the close of the eighteenth century is perfectly reflected in Kant’s *Critique of Practical Reason*. The French bourgeoisie had risen to power thanks to the most tremendous revolution in history, and had victoriously overrun the continent of Europe; the English bourgeoisie, already emancipated politically, had revolutionised industry, had brought India under its political control, and had subjugated all the rest of the world commercially; but the German bourgeoisie was impotent, and could get no further than ‘good will.’ Kant was content with ‘good will’ even when it remained utterly void of effect; the realisation of this ‘good will,’ the establishment of harmony between it and the needs and impulses of individuals would be achieved in a better world. Kant’s ‘good will’ was in perfect

conformity with the impotence, subjugation, and jejuneness of the German burghers, whose petty interests were unable to develop into the general, the national interests of a class, and who were therefore perpetually exploited by the bourgeois of all other nations. To these petty local interests there corresponded, on the one hand, the actual local and provincial narrow-mindedness of the German burghers, and, on the other hand, their inflated cosmopolitan notions. Speaking generally, the development of Germany since the Reformation had been petty bourgeois through and through. For the most part, the members of the old feudal aristocracy had been killed off during the Peasants' Wars. Those who still remained were of two kinds. Some of them were minor princes, whose only suzerain was the emperor, and who gradually acquired a considerable measure of independence, which enabled them to play the part of absolute monarchs on an absurdly small scale. The others were minor landowners, who must, again, be subdivided into two categories. Many of them offered their services to one of the lesser courts, living as army officers or government officials. The rest of them were starveling squires who led a penurious existence at which the most unpretentious English squire or French gentilhomme de province would have turned up his nose. Agriculture was carried on in a way which was neither small scale nor large, but betwixt and between. Although serfdom with all its burdens persisted, the peasants never stirred to demand emancipation, partly because the methods of cultivation were not such as to bring into existence an actively revolutionary class, and partly because there was no revolutionary bourgeoisie to back up such a class of peasants." (Marx on Stirner, *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, vol. III., p. 170.)

Elsewhere, Marx draws attention to a number of the causes that hindered the growth of the German industrial bourgeoisie. The changes in trade routes which occurred during the sixteenth century and which led to the decline of medieval industry and commerce at the very time when a new world market was coming into existence, and when manufacture was springing up in England, Holland, and France; the consequences of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), which depopulated the German countryside and threw it back in certain localities into a state of barbarism; the peculiar nature of such industries as there were (the flax industry), which began to revive towards the close of the eighteenth century though still under patriarchal conditions; the nature of the exports, which were predominantly the products of agriculture and which corresponded to the growth of a huge landed

gentry inimical to the urban bourgeoisie—all these things prevented the development of the German bourgeoisie and impeded its finding political self-expression.

“To the lack of cohesion of interests there corresponded a lack of cohesion in political organisation, so that Germany consisted of petty principalities and the free imperial cities. How could there be political concentration in a land where all the economic conditions for such concentration were lacking?” (*Ibid.*, p. 171.)

Consequently we find in Germany at that date a predominance of the State, and of the bureaucracy which developed under the monarchy and which assumed a specially grotesque and distorted form in that country. The State became, as it were, an independent power, incarnated in the bureaucracy. That accounts for the incorruptibility of the officialdom which is characteristic of Germany; also for the illusions regarding the State which are so prevalent in that country; also for the seeming independence of the theoreticians of State rights, who spin their doctrines without any direct reference to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

“French liberalism, which was based upon actual class interests, likewise assumed a characteristic form when transferred to German soil. We see this once more in the writings of Kant. Neither he nor the German burghers whose spokesman he was noticed that underlying these theoretical ideas of the bourgeoisie were material interests and a specific will determined by the material conditions of production. Consequently, he severed the theoretical expression from the interests he was defending, and regarded the materially determined volitions of the French bourgeoisie as pure self-determinations of ‘free will,’ of the human will unconditioned. Thus in his hands this theoretical expression became a purely ideological concept, a moral postulate. That was why the German petty bourgeoisie shrank back in horror in face of this energetic bourgeois liberalism, as soon as it began to take practical shape in the Reign of Terror and in the unashamed pursuit of wealth.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 171-172.)

It was not until after the July revolution that German liberalism (which had till then been no more than a dream about abstract liberalism and not the philosophy of a developing bourgeoisie struggling for its own class interests) began to assume a more concrete shape. “Now, at long last, the growing intensity of foreign competition, and the development of worldwide commerce from which Germany found

it more and more difficult to hold aloof, forced a measure of integration upon the scattered local interests of the country. The German burghers began, especially from 1840 onwards, to think of establishing these common interests upon a stable foundation; they became nationalists and liberals, demanding protective tariffs and constitutions." (*Ibid.*, p. 172.)

At this juncture, "true" socialism began to put in an appearance. As, in course of time, the real, though perhaps not very amiable-looking interests of the German bourgeoisie began to peep through the time-worn trappings of the old philosophies, as the relations between the rising industrial bourgeoisie and the feudalists became more strained (although the strain was masked by servile protestations of reverence for the monarch), so, concomitantly and with growing ardour, did the "true" socialists, Grun and men of his kidney, denounce the liberalism of the day and hinder the German workers from formulating a political program of their own.

Marx's reply to Heinzen serves equally well as an answer to Grun: "The proletariat does not ask whether the welfare of the people is the chief aim of the bourgeoisie or only a subsidiary one, and whether the bourgeoisie wants to use the proletariat as cannon fodder or not. The proletariat does not ask what the bourgeoisie wants, but what the bourgeoisie is compelled to do. The real question is, which political system will give the proletariat the best chance of attaining its own ends; the extant political system, in which the officialdom holds sway; or the system which the liberals are striving to establish, the dominion of the bourgeoisie. A comparison between the political position of the proletariat in Britain, France, and the United States on the one hand, and in Germany on the other, is enough to convince us that the rise of the bourgeoisie to power will not only supply the proletariat with entirely new weapons for the struggle against the bourgeoisie, but will also give the proletariat a completely new position, the position of a recognised party."

It was from this outlook that Marx and Engels fought so passionately against "true" socialism, which inevitably became transformed into the ideology of the German petty bourgeoisie groaning under the yoke of feudal institutions and simultaneously alarmed at the prospect of the political dominance of the industrial bourgeoisie.

The events of 1848 showed, it is true, that not only the German bourgeoisie (which was already at odds with the proletariat before the

latter fashioned itself into a class, politically speaking), but also the French and the British bourgeoisie, were prepared to forego their own claims as soon as it became evident that the proletariat would make the bourgeois revolution the starting-point for a proletarian revolution. But this merely served to engender new tactics more in conformity with the altered circumstances.

53. PROUDHON.

WE have seen that Sismondi is instanced in the Manifesto as the typical representative of petty-bourgeois socialism. It will come as a surprise to some that Proudhon should be selected as the best representative of conservative or bourgeois socialism, for most of us have been in the habit of looking upon this writer as closely related to petty-bourgeois socialist thought. Here we have additional evidence showing that this particular classification in the Manifesto is now only of historical interest.

Proudhon was born in 1809, and was therefore nearly ten years older than Marx. His two most important works were *Qu'est ce que la propriété* [What is property], published in 1840, and *Système des contradictions économiques ou philosophie de la misère* [System of economic contradictions, or philosophy of poverty], published in 1846. When, in 1865, Proudhon was gathered to his fathers, Marx wrote that the dead man was already in the year 1847 a "philosopher of poverty" whose doctrine had a flavour of "petty-bourgeois socialism."

Time was when Marx had the utmost respect for Proudhon's ideas. In *Die heilige Familie* (1845), he refers to Proudhon as a revolutionist in the realm of political economy. "Proudhon now subjects private property, which is the basis of political economy, to a critical examination, the first examination of a decisive, relentless, and at the same time scientific character. Such is the great scientific advance we owe to Proudhon, an advance which revolutionises political economy, and makes a genuine science of political economy possible for the first time." (*Nachlass*, vol. II., p. 127.)

In a letter to the "Sozialdemokrat" under date January 24, 1865, referring to the same work by Proudhon, Marx expressed himself quite otherwise: "The inadequacy of the book was already indicated by its title. The question was erroneously formulated, and therefore could not be accurately answered. 'Classical property relations' had passed

away, being transformed into 'feudal relations'; and in like manner feudal relations had been transformed into 'bourgeois relations.' That was the sum and substance of his criticism of the old property relations. What Proudhon was really concerned with was extant property, modern bourgeois property. The question, what this is, could only be answered by a critical analysis of political economy, an analysis which should take cognisance of all these property relations, not in their juridical sense as voluntary relations, but in their real form as productive relations. Inasmuch as Proudhon, however, subsumed all these economic relations under the general juridical concept of property, it was impossible for him to get beyond the answer which Brissot (1754-1793) had given long before him (before 1789) in a similar work, saying in the same words as Proudhon, 'property is theft.'" (Reprinted as part of the preparatory matter to later German editions, cf. *Das Elend der Philosophie*, Dietz, Stuttgart, 1885, p. xxviii.)

During the long interval between these conflicting utterances, two important works had appeared: Proudhon's *Philosophie de la misere* (Philosophy of Poverty), and Marx's answer thereto. In *Die heilige Familie* (The Holy Family), Marx, although he wrote from the proletarian point of view, was only beginning to transfer his investigations from the realm of philosophical and juristic criticism to the realm of the criticism of political economy.

Alike in 1840 and in 1846 Proudhon was a petty bourgeois, but with this difference: in the first of his writings he criticised bourgeois society from the point of view of the French minor peasantry; whereas at the later date, in his *Philosophie de la Misere*, his criticism was made from the outlook of the petty bourgeoisie, which was oscillating between the small producers and the workers. Hence the contradiction! Proudhon wished to refashion bourgeois society; but in actual fact all he was out for was to rid that society of the antagonisms raging within it and to change that society into an ideal bourgeois society. Only in the above-mentioned sense can we call Proudhon, in contradistinction to Sismondi (who was the chief representative of *reactionary* petty-bourgeois socialism, wishful to turn back the wheels of history), the protagonist of *conservative* petty-bourgeois socialism. After the 1848 revolution, Proudhon once more modified his opinions. It was then that he evolved his system of "mutualism," which is what people usually think of nowadays when they refer to Proudhonism. This scheme played a great role in the history of the International

Workingmen's Association. The doctrine took on concrete shape in the early sixties, when Proudhon first adapted his theories to the needs of the urban proletariat. This adaptation was largely the outcome of pressure on the part of the expanding working-class movement. The whole system was elaborated in Proudhon's posthumous book, *La capacite politique de la classe ouvriere*, Paris, 1873. In this work, Proudhon speaks of the need for an independent organisation of the proletariat as a class, but he still deplores strikes and is averse to direct participation in the political struggle. To the end he remained an opponent of communism, to which he contraposed co-operation and mutualism, and thus remained until the close of his life a petty-bourgeois socialist.

I 54. BOURGEOIS PHILANTHROPY

THE eighteen-thirties and eighteen-forties marked the zenith of bourgeois philanthropic ideas in western Europe. Pauperism was the crowning evil and must be combated. Every year registered additions to the numbers of writings which dealt with poverty, the "curse of the proletariat," the increase in these books keeping pace with the growth of strikes and factory riots.

Among such well-meaning persons there were a number of "charitymongering acrobats." Those who sincerely desired to see an improvement in the situation of the workers, founded societies, charitable organisations for the benefit of the working class. These benefactors were careful to exclude anything which might "strengthen the dissatisfaction of the workers with their condition in life," or might encourage the workers to organise on their own behalf. There was a plan for the factories to pay premiums for diligence, but this did not catch on. Temperance societies were to endeavour to raise the moral level of the workers. Philanthropic practice had its counterpart in philanthropic theory.

"The philanthropic school is the most highly developed of the humanitarian schools. Those who belong to it deny that there is any need for a contrast [between rich and poor]. They want to make everyone a bourgeois, having a theory which they wish to realise—in so far as theory can differ from practice and free itself from the class antagonisms which in actual practice are seen to exist. Of course, in the domain of theory it is easy enough to ignore the contradictions which one stumbles over at every step in the real world. Thus their

theory will be reality idealised. The philanthropists want to preserve the categories which are the expression of bourgeois conditions, while getting rid of the contradiction which makes up the essence of these conditions and is inseparable from them. Though they fancy that they are engaged in a serious attack on bourgeois practice, the philanthropists are really even more bourgeois than the others." (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 98-99.)

In his free-trade speech Marx gave a brilliant characterisation of those economists who extolled freedom of trade—for the benefit of the working class! "It is hard indeed to understand how the free traders can make the amazing assumption that a better use of capital will put an end to the opposition between the industrial capitalists and the wage earners. The result would be the very opposite. The only result would be to make the opposition between the two classes even more conspicuous."

At the congress of economists held in Brussels during September, 1847, Rittinghausen (1814-1890, a socialist, who in later years acquired considerable renown as the champion of the referendum and the initiative) came forward in defence of protective tariffs—in the interest of the working class! The "Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung," commenting on Rittinghausen's speech, observed that it might have been mistaken for a speech by the protectionist, Friedrich List (1789-1846), although the latter's public utterances had been wont to be livelier and brighter in style.

Simultaneously with the above-named congress, and in the same city, there was held a congress for the purpose of promoting prison reform. The philanthropic advocates of ameliorations in the penal system showed that solitary confinement was the best means for raising the moral standard of working-class criminals. It was finally decided to found an international society which should aim at improving the lot of the working class and of the poor. Solitary confinement—for the benefit of the working class!

• 55. BABEUF.

WHEN Eduard Bernstein (b. 1850) began his attack on revolutionary Marxism, he endeavoured to prove that Marx and Engels were, in essence, no more than spiritual disciples of Blanqui (1798-1854), who in his turn was a Babouvist (a follower of Babeuf—1760-1797):

Support of this contention was found by Bernstein in the circumstance that throughout the whole of socialist literature there is no criticism of Babouvist theory.

Charles Andler, however, is confident that, though Babeuf's views are not openly discussed in the Manifesto, nevertheless Babeuf is by implication classed among the reactionaries, as one of those who "preached universal ascetism and a crude equalitarianism." (cf. Andler, *Le Manifeste Communiste*, p. 191.)

Not only is there no account of Babeuf's writings in the Manifesto; in addition there does not occur a single reference to Blanqui. In the section on critical-utopian socialism and communism, the Manifesto makes no mention of the revolutionary communists, and it passes in silence over the French communist materialists. There is actually no reference to such communists as Gay and Dezamy. Even Cabet (1788-1856) comes in for no direct mention, although he is the only contemporary communist whose works the writers of the Manifesto unquestionably had in mind when writing the above section.

Babeuf was never a theoretician of communism, and to an even less degree could Blanqui claim to be anything of the sort. "To take Babeuf as the theoretical exponent of communism could only have entered the head of a Berlin schoolmaster." (Marx on Stirner, *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, vol. III., pp. 309-310.)

Nevertheless, writing in 1845, Marx assigns a notable place to Babeuf in the history of socialist thought.

While expounding to Karl Heinzen, the democrat, the important part played by socialist ideas in the course of the French revolution, Marx emphasised Babeuf's role as an active champion of proletarian demands. "The first appearance of a really effective communist party takes place during the progress of the bourgeois revolution at the moment when the constitutional monarchy is abolished. The most logical communists (in England, the Levellers, and in France, Babeuf, Buonarroti, and so forth), are the first to stress social questions. In *Gracchus Babeuf et la conjuration des egaux*, written by Babeuf's friend and comrade, Buonarroti [Englished by Bronterre O'Brien as *Buonarroti's History of Babeuf's Conspiracy for Equality*], we read now these republicans learned by practical experience that, even if such 'social questions' as monarchy versus republic could be settled,

this would not solve one single 'social question' in the proletarian sense of the words." (*Nachlass*, II., 548.)

Towards the close of the eighteen-twenties, when (under the intellectual leadership of Buonarroti, who preached the old "equalitarian" gospel) the Babouvists played a part in the French revolutionary movement, they more and more cut adrift from those who were merely republicans, and they became increasingly associated with the proletarian communist circles. Before the revolution of 1848, the Babouvists were forced to carry on their work underground. Then, during the February days, they exercised a decisive influence, and were able to maintain this influence down to the suppression of the movement in June. Under the leadership of Blanqui (who had just been released from gaol), they helped to form a really powerful proletarian party.

We see, therefore, that the importance of Babeuf's teachings is not to be found in the realm of the growth of a communist system of ideas, but, rather, in the realm of the growth of proletarian organisation and tactics, in the formulation of a program embodying the minimum demands to be put forward during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Precisely because of their influence in this realm were the Babouvists able to become an active revolutionary party, in spite of the fact that, in the writings of some of them, we encounter reactionary ideas about "universal asceticism and a crude equalitarianism." Marx pointed out that Babouvist materialism was both "rough and uncivilised."

Engels explains why asceticism not only characterised all the risings of medieval days, but likewise, at the outset, tinged with religious hues every proletarian movement of recent times. "This ascetic puritanism, this insistence upon the need for renouncing all the joys and pleasures of life, represents, on the one hand, an assertion of the principle of Spartan equality as against the ruling classes; and is, on the other hand, a necessary stage of transition, without which the lowest stratum of society can never set itself in motion. If the members of this class are to foster their revolutionary energies, if they are to become fully aware that their position is one of hostility towards all the other elements of society, if they are to concentrate themselves as a class, they must begin by ridding themselves of everything that might still reconcile them with the existing order, they must renounce the few pleasures which make their hard existence temporarily endurable and which even the utmost oppression cannot snatch from them. This plebeian and proletarian

asceticism is sharply distinguished both in its fiercely fanatical form and in its substance from the bourgeois asceticism preached by the Lutheran bourgeois moralists and the English Puritans (as contrasted with the Independents and with other sects of ultras); for the whole secret of bourgeois asceticism is bourgeois thrift. Furthermore we have to realise that this plebeian and proletarian asceticism forfeits its revolutionary character in proportion as the development of the modern forces of production leads to an unlimited increase in the supply of the concrete materials for enjoyment, thus rendering Spartan equality superfluous; and, further, in proportion as the position of the proletariat, and therewith the proletariat itself, becomes ever more revolutionary." (Friedrich Engels, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, pp. 60-61; cf. Olgin's translation, *The Peasant War in Germany*, pp. 74-75.)

Among the independent movements of that stratum of society which can be looked upon as a more or less developed forerunner of the modern proletariat, Engels reckoned, in addition to the Levellers (or, rather, to the extreme left wing of the Levellers) during the English revolution (Civil War and Commonwealth) and to Babeuf during the French revolution, the insurrection headed by Thomas Munzer (1490-1525) during the period of the Reformation and of the Peasant War in Germany, an insurrection which was the expression of discontent among the proletarian elements in the plebeian population of Thuringia. "Munzer's philosophy of religion bordered on atheism, and in like manner his political program was closely akin to communism. As late as the eve of the February revolution [1848], there were communist sects whose theoretical arsenal was hardly so well equipped as that of Munzer and his associates in the sixteenth century." (Friedrich Engels, *Bauernkrieg*, p. 54; cf. English translation p. 66.)

It was in the sixteenth century that the first utopian aspirations towards an ideal society found expression as a protest against the developing capitalism of the day. It had its roots in the very soil of capitalism and found its protagonist in Thomas More (1478-1535): [*Utopia*, 1516; in English, 1551.] More was followed by Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639). [*Civitas Solis*, 1623, English translation, by Thomas W. Halliday, *The City of the Sun*, in Henry Morley's *Ideal Commonwealths*, Routledge, London, 1885.]

During the course of the eighteenth century, communist theories were propounded by such men as the poor parish priest Meslier (1664-

1729), and Morely (dates of birth and death unknown; books published 1743-1755).

It is upon these man's theories that Babeuf and his disciples founded their criticism of extant inequality and based their practical demands.

• 56. THE GREAT UTOPISTS

The systems devised by Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Fourier (1772-1837), and Owen (1771-1858), belong to the nineteenth century. One and all they were inspired by the great French revolution and were evolved out of the conditions created by large-scale industry.

Engels was not alone in pointing out how deeply indebted scientific socialism was to these three great utopists. "The exponents of German scientific socialism will never forget how much they owe to Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen. These three men, fantastic and utopian though their doctrines are, must be reckoned among the most fertile thinkers of any age. Men of prophetic genius, they foreshadowed much that we of later days are able to establish on a firm, scientific foundation."

The writings of the great utopists were, first and foremost, accounts of Cuckoo Cloudland. Nevertheless their criticism of bourgeois society struck at the very foundations of that society, and provided valuable material for the enlightenment of the workers. Nay more, after we have stripped off the utopian trappings, we find that these writings give useful pointers as to the positive demands which the proletariat can voice in times of social revolution.

These three leading utopists did not, however, exercise an identical influence upon the founders of scientific socialism.

Saint-Simon's influence was small, especially upon Marx. Engels recognised that Saint-Simon's defence of proletarian interests was compatible with bourgeois aspirations. At the outset Saint-Simon came forward as a champion of industrial society against feudalism. He divided society into three classes: the feudal class, the middle class, and the class of the industrialists. He included in the last-named class not only the workers, but also the factory owners, the merchants, and, in general, all the industrial capitalists. These industrial magnates, guided by the savants, the scientists, were to be supreme in the future society. "We must not forget that only in the very last of his works [*Le nouveau christianisme*, 1825], does Saint-Simon directly advocate the cause of the workers, declaring their emancipation to be the final aim

of his activities. His earlier writings are nothing more than panegyrics on modern bourgeois society as contrasted with feudal society, or on the industrialists and the bankers as contrasted with the field-marshal and the law-makers of the Napoleonic era. What a difference when we compare his utterances with those of Owen, whose works appeared contemporaneously." (*Karl Marx, Das Kapital*, 4th edition, vol. III., part II., p. 144.)

Engel, in a note to these words of Marx, informs us that the latter, when revising his manuscript, would undoubtedly have modified the foregoing passage considerably. But Engels forgets that he himself, in *Anti-Duhring*, was obliged to emphasise the very same thing. While it is quite true that Marx spoke admiringly of Saint-Simon, referring to his genius and his encyclopedic knowledge, and using practically the same expressions about him both in 1847 and in 1863, this does not affect the fact that of the three great utopists, Saint-Simon was the one whose writings had the least influence upon Marx. It is worth noting that neither in the three volumes of *Capital*, nor in any other of his writings does Marx quote Saint-Simon in support of his own views.

At the time when Marx undertook the study of socialist systems, he had already passed through a vital experience in the struggle against the Prussian feudal social order, the struggle in which he had fought shoulder to shoulder with the representatives of the new industrial bourgeoisie in the Rhine provinces. He came to the conclusion that it did not suffice merely to criticise a social order in general terms; the essential criticism must be economic. That was why he turned away from Saint-Simon to Fourier and Owen, whose works in respect of social criticism he esteemed far more highly than those of the author of *Le nouveau christianisme*.

It is just as ridiculous to try and make out that, as far as the materialist conception of history is concerned, Marx was a pupil of Saint-Simon, as it would be to maintain that he was a pupil of Saint-Simon in the realm of political economy (as was Rodbertus, for example).

Engels tried to make the most of Saint-Simon's services, no less than of Fourier's and Owen's but even Engels had to admit that Saint-Simon, though he grasped the essence of nearly all the latter-day socialist theories, failed to do so in the domain of political economy.

In one point alone—and this is emphasised in the Manifesto—may

Saint-Simon be said to have anticipated Marx, namely, in his idea of converting the State into a simple administration of the processes of production. "In 1816 he declared that politics was the science of production, and foretold the complete merging of politics into economics. Here the fact that economic conditions are the basis of political institutions appears only in a germinal form. Still, we already have a definite statement that the political government of men will be transformed into the administration of things and the management of the processes of production. The abolition of the State, so widely trumpeted now-a-days, is clearly foreshadowed." (Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, p. 246.)

Thus Saint-Simon's philosophy and his historical theories could not have exercised an influence on Marx, who, as early as 1842, was a more consistent materialist than he had ever been an idealist. Fourier and Owen, who were likewise materialists, are on quite a different footing in relation to Marx. (Without a logically consistent materialism (a conception of things which has cleared away all the mystical cobwebs from the realm of human relation and human history), there cannot possibly be a consistent communism.

We need but compare Engels' account of Fourier with his account of Saint-Simon to see how easy it was for Engels to find words and facts illustrative of Fourier's services, and how difficult it was for him to discover anything whatsoever in Saint-Simon's writing that would serve his turn in this respect. In actual fact, Fourier had much influence both on Engels and on Marx.

In *The Holy Family* and in many other of his writings, Marx quotes Fourier in confirmation of his own views. Fourier's criticism of marriage and of the family in bourgeois society is characterised by Marx as "masterly"; his ideas of education as "the best that exist in that field, and full of profound insight."

As early as 1846, Engels contrasted Fourier's teachings with that of the exponents of "true" socialism, and undertook to publish the Frenchman's more important works in German translations. The plan was never realised, and Engels had to content himself with the translation of an article by Fourier concerning commerce. Engels' profound knowledge of Fourier's writings is very evident in his brilliant characterisation of Fourier, wherein we may discern not only respect, but also a personal liking for the great French utopist.

"Fourier's writings contain a criticism of extant social conditions, a criticism which is none the less profound because brightly penned, as we

are wont to expect from a Frenchman. He deals trenchantly with the bourgeoisie, quoting their inspired prophets of the days before the revolution and their sycophants of the days that followed it. Inexorably he shows how impoverished is the bourgeois world both materially and morally, despite the brilliant promises of the days of the Enlightenment, whose apostles used to talk of a coming society in which reason would rule and civilisation would diffuse happiness and would perfect mankind. He quotes the pretty phrases of contemporary bourgeois ideologists, showing how pitiful are the corresponding realities, and he overwhelms the hopeless fiasco with ridicule. Fourier is not merely a critic, his cheerful disposition makes him a satirist, and one of the greatest satirists that ever lived. Wittily and in masterly fashion he describes the frenzy of speculation, the spirit of all-devouring commercialism, which had taken possession of France after the decline of the revolution. Even more remarkable is his criticism of the bourgeois development of sex relations and of the position of women in bourgeois society. He was the first to point out that, in any given society, the extent to which woman is emancipated is an index to the general degree of emancipation. But Fourier is at his best in his outlook on the history of society. He divides the course of that history into four phases of development: savagery, barbarism, the patriarchal, and civilisation. This last corresponds to the period of what is called bourgeois society; it is the social order that began with the sixteenth century. He shows that 'civilisation complicates, intensifies, renders ambiguous and hypocritical, all the vices which under barbarism exist in a comparatively simple form'; that civilisation moves in a 'false circulation,' moves amid contradictions which it continually reproduces without being able to overcome them, so that it is incessantly achieving the very opposite of what it wants or professes to want. Thus it is, for example, that "in civilisation poverty arises out of superfluity itself." (Engels, *Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, p. 22; cf. *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, pp. 16-18.)

Owen's influence upon Engels was no less profound than Fourier's, and when he first came to England, Engels contributed to Owen's *New Moral World*. Marx was even more strongly influenced by Owen's ideas. In many parts of *Capital*, Marx lets us see how important he felt Owen's system to be, more especially because "Owen not only set out from the factory system in his experiments, but declared this system as far as theory was concerned to be the starting-point of the social revolution." (*Capital*, I., 544, footnote.) In this respect, Owen occupies a higher place than Saint-Simon and even than Fourier; just

so much higher as in his day England, as a capitalist country, was superior to France, where large-scale production was still in its infancy. After his conversion to communism, Owen concentrated his attack upon the main obstacles which prevented the transformation of the bourgeois social order into a communist social order: *i.e.*, his onslaughts were upon private property, religion, and contemporary forms of marriage. He was a hard-shelled materialist, and based his theories upon the idea that human character is the outcome of exterior influences, that man does not possess any innate ideas or qualities or moral sentiment or conscience, and that none of these things are instilled into his mind by any kind of supernatural power. "The fact is that conscience is just as much a manufacture as cotton or any material." This observation has a far deeper significance than all the thoughts of ordinary, non-historical, materialists put together. Both in the field of theory and in the practical sphere, Owen did yeoman service in the matter of labour legislation; he was the first to advocate the combination of factory work with education for the children who worked in industry (the germ of the Labour School); he was the father both of productive and of distributive co-operation. He did not share in the illusions of his imitators as to the importance of such isolated reforms, as he looked upon them merely as transitional devices on the way to a communist social order. No one else, excepting Fourier, worked so earnestly as Owen to discover a plan for doing away with the antagonisms between town and countryside; for Owen was fully aware of the need for mutual understanding between the urban and the rural workers.

* 57. COMMUNISTS IN FRANCE AND IN GERMANY

Etienne Cabet (1788-1856), a French republican and communist, was the author of a social romance, *Voyage en Icarie*, which caused quite a stir. On the eve of the February revolution (1848), an expedition set forth to found a utopian settlement of "Icarians" in the United States of America. He hoped to realise his utopian dreams in the very midst of a capitalist social order; he thought to build his New Jerusalem on American soil. Not content with appealing to bourgeois sympathies, he turned to the workers, among whom he found many disposed to give him a kindly hearing. In 1847, he had already drawn up plans for the founding of his little Icaria. He appealed to various working-class organisations for help, among others to the Communist Workers' Educational Society in London, whose leading members (Bauer, Moll,

Schapper, Lessner, etc.) played so important a part in the formation of the Communist League. While recognising Cabet's services in the workers' struggle, the members of the Communist Workers' Educational Society expressed opposition to his scheme. They explained that the inevitable disaster attendant on any such plan would merely delight the bourgeoisie; that, even for communists, the community of property he proposed would be unrealisable without a transition period during which private property would gradually be done away with; Cabet, they urged, was trying to reap where he had not sown. Our Icarian journeyed to London in the hope of convincing them as to the feasibility of his plans—in vain! The Comic Spirit smiled grimly when these pioneers sailed across the seas. Even as they weighed anchor, the first mutterings of the revolutionary storms of 1848 were to be heard. The original expedition of 1,500 Icarians was followed in the course of the year by further detachments. They abandoned the fight in the old world when it was in full swing, to return, a few years later, to the land of their birth, disappointed and disillusioned.

Apart from such communists, who hoped to bring about the social change by peaceful methods, there were, both in Germany and in France, communists with a revolutionary outlook. The most notable revolutionary communist before Marx and Engels' day, was Wilhelm Weitling (1808-1870), a tailor by trade. Although his name is not mentioned in the Manifesto, he is undoubtedly envisaged in the references to the group dominated by Babouvist ideas. Nay more. In the first section of the Manifesto there occurs a passage that is incontestably aimed at Weitling, who (like Bakunin at a later date) ascribed a very important role to the slum or tatterdemalion proletariat (*Lumpenproletariat*), looking upon this class of society as the most trustworthy and most revolutionary element.

Like Fourier, Weitling started his criticism of the social order by an analysis of the passions and needs of mankind. In constructing his plan of a future society, he gave a leading position to the representatives of the applied sciences. He considered that the best way of establishing the new social order would be to bring the extant social disorder to such a pass that the patience of the people would be exhausted. He could not reconcile himself to the notion of a transitional period during which (in Germany, where the bourgeois revolution had not yet taken place) the bourgeoisie would function as the ruling class. This clash of ideas was the main cause of Weitling's quarrel with Marx, although one of the

first articles to welcome Weitling's *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* (1842) was written by Marx. He speaks of the book as a "fiery and brilliant debut of the German workers," and compares it to the "dry and timid mediocrity of the political literature" of Germany at that date. The final rupture between Marx and Weitling took place on March 30, 1846, about a year before the creation of the Communist League.

Associated with underground work in France was another revolutionary communist group, which did not cease to function even after the unsuccessful attempt at a rising in May, 1839. In addition to Blanqui and Barbes, the future founders of the German communist organisation in London took part in this rising. The leaders of this group of French communists, men who enjoyed much favour among working-class circles, were Dezamy and his comrades.

In his interesting excursus upon the history of French materialism, Marx shows how communist theory derives from the French materialist philosophy of the eighteenth century. He writes: "Fourier sets out from the doctrine of the French materialists. The Babouvists were crude, uncivilised materialists; but developed communism likewise derives directly from French materialism. The fact is that this doctrine, after assuming the form given to it by Helvetius, came back to England, the land of its birth. Bentham founded his system of 'self-interest rightly understood,' upon the ethical notions of Helvetius; and in like manner Owen, starting from Bentham's system, became the founder of British communism. Cabet, a Frenchman exiled to England, came under the influence of the communist ideas that were stirring in that country, and then went back to France to become the most popular though most superficial representative of communism in his native land. Like Owen, the French scientific communists (Dezamy, Gay, etc.), developed materialist theory in the form of a realist humanism as the logical foundation of communism." (Marx, *Die heilige Familie*, VI., 3, d. Reprinted in *Nachlass*, vol. II., pp. 239-240.)

Dezamy, whose name occurs in some of Marx's other writings, played an active part in the communist workers' circles. He was a thoroughgoing communist, an admirer of Morelly, Babeuf, and Buonarroti. Like Weitling, he came directly into touch with the proletariat; but, as contrasted with the German communist, Dezamy was a consistent materialist. Influenced by his utopian predecessors, he drew up a detailed scheme for the establishment of a communist social order, and hoped by the propaganda of this scheme to pave the way

for the conversion of contemporary society into one of a higher type: *i.e.*, into a communist society. Apart from his utopian schemes, however, his criticism of the bourgeois social order (which contains a dash of Owenism and Fourierism) undoubtedly had a great influence of Marx's thought. An echo of Dezamy's criticism of bourgeois society has found its way into the Manifesto. Dezamy and his followers attracted many workers to their side; and the "communist materialists" of all shades (as we have already had occasion to point out) played an important part in the underground activities which preceded the revolution of 1848. These elements formed the nucleus of the Blanquist party.

In addition to his shorter writings on Lamennais and Cabet, notable books by Dezamy were *Code de la Communaute*, 1842, *Organisation de la liberte et du bien-etre universel*, 1846, and *Le Jesuitisme vaincu et aneanti par le socialisme*, 1845; he also edited an *Almanach de la communaute*, for the workers.

* 58. OWENITES AND CHARTISTS

Unlike Saint-Simon and Fourier, Owen, once he had broken away from the outlooks of the conventional society of his day, threw himself heart and soul into the proletarian movement, fighting for decades shoulder to shoulder with the workers. Nevertheless he remained a pacifist utopist, and refused to take part in revolutionary activity. He was unable to understand the need for organising the workers so as to form a specifically proletarian political party as opposed to bourgeois political parties. This explains Owen's attitude towards the Chartists, who were struggling for the full political rights of the working class. The relations between Owenites and Chartists during the eighteen forties are painted for us by Engels in his book on the condition of the working class in England. Here is what he writes:

"The socialists [as contrasted with the communists] are thoroughly tame and peaceable; they endorse existing conditions (however bad) to this extent, that they reject all other methods for altering them except by way of peaceful persuasion. At the same time their theories are so abstract that, in the present form, these theories are never likely to win adherents. . . . The socialists ignore the whole process of historical development and think it possible to introduce communism on a nation-wide scale without going through a period of transition, to introduce it overnight as it were. They cannot see that the march of political events

will lead up to the inauguration of a communist social order when the time is ripe for the transition, when such a change becomes both possible and necessary. They understand why the workers harbour feelings of resentment against the bourgeoisie; but they look upon this class hatred as barren in its results. They fail to see that it is precisely this resentment which acts as the moral incentive that will bring the worker nearer to his goal. Their gospel of philanthropy and universal love is especially sterile under the conditions prevailing in England to-day." (Friedrich Engels, *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*, Stuttgart, 1892, pp. 239-240; cf. English translation, pp. 236-237.)

Engels did not close his eyes to the fact that the Chartists were very crude and undeveloped. Still, he recognised that they were authentic proletarians, that they really and truly represented the interests of the working class. For this reason he considered it essential to link up the socialists with the Chartists, and he himself laboured hard to bring such a coalition into being by keeping in close touch both with the Owenites and the Chartists.

The Fourierists in collaboration with Considerant (1808-1893) now replaced their old newspaper "La Phalange" by a daily journal entitled "La Democratie Pacifique." The name suffices to indicate the policy of the paper. It conducted a campaign in favour of "reforms," and became the mouthpiece of the French democratic socialists. As Engels wrote in *The Holy Family*, this was nothing more than Fourierism watered down with the social theories of the bourgeois philanthropists. Considerant, whom some anarchists would fain have us believe was Marx's and Engels' teacher, undertook the task of reconciling the interests of the contending classes. Already in the eighteen-thirties he prophesied the "downfall of politics in France." After the 1848 revolution, he continued to dream of founding a new phalanstery which should, by its example, "convince" the capitalist class. Considerant went out to Texas, where he founded a communistic colony named La Reunion, which, like other attempts of the kind, came to grief in its struggle against the hard facts of the situation. He returned to Paris in 1869, after the colony had broken up through internecine squabbles, and he died on May 8, 1893. Even in advanced old age he had the interests of the working class at heart, and gave the newly awakened working class movement in France a most cordial welcome.

IV.

ATTITUDE OF COMMUNISTS TOWARDS THE VARIOUS
OPPOSITION PARTIES

59. COMMUNISTS AND THE WORKING-CLASS ORGANISATIONS OF ENGLAND AND OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

IN the second chapter of the Manifesto, the relations between the communists and other working-class parties were considered. We saw, that the communists do not constitute a party in opposition to other working-class parties. Consequently, wherever there exists a workers' party, the communists merely form a considerable section of such a party, having this advantage, that their theoretical training enables them to understand the conditions, the progress, and the general results of the workers' movement. Thus it was that the communists were in a position to make their influence felt in the two working-class organisations which were flourishing about the middle of last century: the Chartists in England, and the champions of agrarian reform in the United States of America.

Marx, and more especially Engels, both of whom had already formed ties with the Chartists, now (after the publication of the Manifesto) entered into still closer relationships with the communist wing of the Chartist movement, with such men as George Julian Harney (1817-1899) and Ernest Jones (1819-1869). The intimacy was encouraged and aided by the London members of the Communist League.

Matters took a very different course in the United States, where the Communist League had not secured an independent footing. Among the German workers settled in north America, the one to exercise the most notable influence was Hermann Kriege (1820-1850), who had emigrated to the States in 1845. He got into touch with the American organisation known as the National Reform Association, which had been inaugurated in 1845 with a view to acting as the legal cover to the secret society Young America. This latter was, as Engels says, endeavouring to impart a democratic form to the government, as a weapon against the bourgeoisie, and to use this to further the cause of the proletariat. There is no reason to identify Young America with the Anti-Rent League, as does Andler. The latter organisation was formed at a considerably earlier date as the outcome

of a powerful agrarian movement in New York State during the year 1839.

The farmers rented their farms from persons to whom thousands upon thousands of acres had been granted capriciously. In the early days rents had been moderate, but the more practical descendants of the original concessionaries put on the screw, and tried to extort a much larger tribute. Thereupon the farmers began a no-rent campaign, and an agrarian revolt broke out. This agitation found a more peaceable outlet in the Anti-Rent League, which instituted legal proceedings challenging the landowners' claims to extort rent.

The leaders of Young America now took a hand in this movement, and, through the instrumentality of the National Reform Association, drew up a more radical program of agrarian demands. Among other things they put forward such claims as the nationalisation of the land, and the limitation of farms to the size of 160 acres.

In October, 1845, Young America held a congress in Boston and invited the New England Working Man's Association (which had been started that very year) to take part. The congress adopted a program wherein the right to live and the right to freedom were proclaimed, and, in addition, it was declared that a man had a right to receive so much land as was essential to the maintenance of himself and his dependents.

Marx had no illusions as to the nature of such a program. He and those of his way of thinking therefore protested against Kriege's endeavour to build upon the movement for agrarian reform, to give it a more definite, a higher aim, to take it as a model for the communist movement.

"We should have had no reason to complain if Kriege had looked upon the movement to free the land from private ownership as no more than a preliminary form of the young proletarian movement, a form necessary for that movement under certain specific conditions; if he had considered that the agrarian movement was inevitably destined to be transformed into a communist movement owing to the peculiar position of the class in which it originated; if he had shown that communist trends in America must at first assume such an agrarian form—which is ostensibly antagonistic to communist principles." (*Nachlass*, Vol. II, pp. 421-422.) The first effect of this movement was to hasten the development of industrialism in contemporary bourgeois society. Still, as it also speeded up the proletarian move-

ment, and was an attack on private property in land, Marx considered that, on the whole, the affair tended to promote the communist cause.

After securing a few paltry reforms in the realm of agrarian legislation, the movement petered out. In essence it was a farmers' agitation, and the industrial workers who participated in it, few in number, were swept into a back-to-the-land movement.

During the period from 1845 to 1848, Marx and Engels considered it of the utmost importance to get into touch with an organisation which undoubtedly exercised a good deal of influence upon the American workers, although, as we have already seen from the controversy Marx had with the democrat Heinzen, the former had an exaggerated idea of the extent to which proletarians were contributing to the agrarian agitation.

"In England the workers, under the name of Chartists, and in the United States the workers, under the name of National Reformers, created political parties. Their slogans were no longer: Monarchy or Republic. On the contrary, they put forward the alternatives: Rule of the Working Class or Rule of the Bourgeoisie." (*Nachlass*, Vol. II, p. 460.) This statement was an exaggeration, due to lack of sufficient information.

We may glean something of the importance Marx and Engels attached to the whole of this affair by the following incident. The German communists in Brussels decided that a circular must be sent to Kriege wherein his tactics in relation to the American movement should be severely criticised. Weitling was the only member of the group who refused to sign this document. It brought matters to a head between the communists who were coming over to Marx's and Engels' outlooks and those of the Kriege type who were endeavouring to combine revolutionary utterances with dissertations on matters ethical and religious.

*60. COMMUNISTS AND RADICALS IN FRANCE AND IN SWITZERLAND

THE social democracy in France at that time was characteristically represented by Ledru-Rollin (1807-1874) and Louis-Blanc (1811-1882). In 1848 it was destined to play a most ignominious part. Its members were drawn from the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They had no clear idea as to the conditions requisite for

the workers' emancipation, they placed their hopes upon such issues as "the right to work," "the organisation of labour," the foundation of societies for co-operative production, and the like. The tactics Engels recommended in relation to the social democrats were as follows: "At critical moments, therefore, the communists will have to make common cause with the democratic socialists, and, temporarily at least, to co-operate in a general line of action. But they can do this only so long as the democratic socialists do not enter the service of the ruling bourgeoisie and refrain from attacking the communists. It is obvious, however, that such common action does not exclude the discussion of theoretical differences." (*Principles of Communism*. End of Answer to Question 24.)

The most important journal expressing the views of the democratic socialists was "La Reforme." Among its contributors were Flocon, Louis Blanc, etc. Engels was delegated to get in touch with those who ran the newspaper, and he thus made Flocon's and Louis Blanc's acquaintance. In order to strengthen the bonds between himself and his new friends he contributed articles on the movement in Britain, and thus joined the staff of "La Reforme."

In Switzerland, the communists were advised to support the radicals. Though the latter formed no more than an insignificant group, it was the only one with which the communists could collaborate at the time. Most of the Swiss radicals were to be found in the French-speaking cantons of Geneva and Vaud. In Geneva, a democratic revolution had broken out in October, 1846, led by the journalist, James Fazy (1796-1878). Thereafter, the radical party gained in strength, becoming more akin to the French republicans. In February, 1845, at Lausanne, the capital of Vaud, the conservative administration had had to yield before a popular rising, and to give place to men of radical views. Druey (1799-1855) became head of the cantonal administration. He was later to form part of the committee for the revision of the federal constitution, and he sponsored a proposal to introduce into the cantonal constitution a clause on the "organisation of labour." As we have seen, this demand was included in the program of the French democratic socialists. When the German socialists and even the democrats were obliged, after the unsuccessful rising in May, 1849, to seek hospitality in Switzerland, both Fazy and Druey proved faithful henchmen of the European reaction. But during the years 1847 and 1848 their political reputation was unblemished. They took

a prominent part in the Sonderbund War. The Sonderbund (Separate League) was a league of the seven conservative cantons under clerical guidance. It had been formed in order to combat the more progressive federal government. Engels writes in this connection: "Now, when the democrats are supporting the struggle of the civilised, industrial, modern-democratic part of Switzerland against the uncultured Christian-Teutonic democracy of the cattle-keeping primary cantons, they are the representatives of progress, they cease to show the least kinship to reaction, they make it clear that they are grasping the significance of democracy in the nineteenth century." (*Nachlass*, Vol. II, p. 446.) In the fight against the Jesuits and the adherents of the Sonderbund, who enjoyed the patronage of Metternich and Guizot, the European democrats and socialists gave the whole of their sympathy to the radical cantons, which had entered upon the decisive stage of the struggle. In November, 1847, first Fribourg, then Zug, then Lucerne capitulated. These defeats effected the complete disorganisation of the Sonderbund, and in a couple of weeks the War of Secession was at an end.

The Democratic League, not long after its foundation in Brussels by Marx and other German communists, decided at its third sitting to send an address to the Swiss people. Herein all sincere democrats were called upon to give support to the Swiss radicals in their endeavour to throw off the "yoke of the priests," and to destroy the Sonderbund. This document was signed by Marx, by Jules Valles (1832-1885), compositor and author, by Wilhelm Wolff (1809-1864)—to whom Marx dedicated the first volume of *Capital*—the representative of the German Workers' Society of Brussels, by Moses Hess (1812-1875), and others.

*61. COMMUNISTS AND THE POLISH QUESTION

THE party which the communists were advised to support in Poland was the Polish Democratic Society, which had been founded in 1832 as a counterblast to the activities of the aristocratic sections among the Polish exiles. Polish democrats believed that the chief reason for the failure of the revolution in 1830-1831 was the selfishness of their aristocratic fellow countrymen. They maintained that the salvation of Poland could not be secured by armed risings alone, but that a radical and democratic revolution must take place simultaneously. The aim of the democrats was, therefore, to appeal to the people, to the peasants.

To secure popular support, they included in their program a demand for the liberation of the peasants and for the freeing of the countryside from feudalist oppression. In 1845, influenced by its Prussian and Austrian branches, the Democratic Society decided to prepare for a fresh uprising, under the leadership of Mieroslawski (1814-1878). On January 24, 1846, a national government was proclaimed in Cracow. This national body issued a manifesto on February 22nd wherein the peasants were promised equality of rights, and free possession of the lands cultivated by them. The rising failed. Incited by the most outrageously demagogic methods (methods in the use of which Metternich was a past master), the peasants were themselves instrumental in bringing defeat upon the movement by massacring thousands of Polish landowners. The minute republic of Cracow, a remnant of independent Poland which had been left after the various partitions, was, with the consent of Prussia and of Russia, united to Austria.

This rising evoked the sympathy of the democrats throughout Europe. It proved to be the prelude of the revolutionary events which convulsed the Continent in 1847 and culminated in the February revolution of 1848. In spite of the tragical upshot, the socialist trend of the rising appealed to the broad masses of the people, who were well aware of the difference between this revolutionary movement and those which had taken place in the years 1830-1831. The Poles won fresh sympathy, this time from among the members of the working class. We may say without fear of exaggeration, that the restoration of Polish independence first became a live issue among the working classes of England, France, and Germany after the Cracow rebellion.

This explains why, from 1847 onward, the Polish question was always included in the agenda at any important international congress of European democrats. At the meeting held in London on November 29, 1847, to commemorate the Polish revolution of 1830-1831, Marx and Engels spoke of the importance of the Polish question to the European proletariat.

In his speech, Marx pointed out that the Polish question was part of the general movement for the emancipation of the working folk. "If the peoples are to unite in the genuine meaning of the term, they must have a common interest. But before they can have a common interest, the extant property relations must be abolished, for the extant property relations bring about the exploitation of one people by another. Only the working class is interested in abolishing

the extant property relations. Only the working class possesses the means for abolishing them. The victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie will simultaneously put an end to the national and industrial conflicts which to-day make the various peoples hostile one to the other. Consequently the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie will give the signal for the liberation of all oppressed nations." (From the report in the "Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung," 1847, No. 98.)

Engels explained why the Polish struggle for freedom was of particular interest to Germans. He said: "No nation can be free so long as it keeps another nation in chains. Hence the emancipation of Germany can never be accomplished until the Germans liberate the Poles from the German yoke." (*Ibid.*)

At the meeting which assembled on February 22, 1848, to commemorate the Cracow rising, Marx once more broached the Polish question. He wished to make his audience understand the full significance of the events in Cracow. The lesson he drew from this revolt was that national emancipation was intimately linked up with the democratic movement, that is to say with the liberation of an oppressed class. For this reason the liberation, not of feudalist Poland, but of democratic Poland, was a matter which concerned the whole of the European democracy.

Engels, at the same meeting, laid stress on the tasks confronting the German people. The Cracow rising had converted a purely Polish affair into an affair affecting the peoples of all nations; what had been no more than sentimental phrasemongering, had become a practical issue touching the activities of all democrats. Germany in especial should rejoice, for in a democratic Poland she would find a trustworthy ally, an ally having the same interests as herself. The political revolutionising of Germany, the disappearance of Prussia and Austria as dominating factors in Central Europe, the retreat of tsarist Russia behind the rivers Dniester and Dvina, would be the prelude to German and to Polish liberation.

It will now be clear why Marx and Engels were so insistent that communists should support that party among the Poles which realised that the national emancipation of Poland must be brought about by an agrarian revolution such as had taken place in the republic of Cracow in 1846.

62. TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS IN GERMANY

IN Germany, the communists are advised to join hands with the bourgeoisie in so far as the latter is waging a revolutionary war against the forces of reaction.

Marx and Engels were only too well aware of the lukewarmness and irresolution of the German bourgeoisie. Even that section of the German bourgeoisie which was concerned in the development of industry in the Rhine provinces and in Westphalia belonged to the opposition movement; and even the regular contributors to the "Rheinische Zeitung" of which Marx was editor, such men as Camphausen (1803-1890), Hansemann (1790-1864), Mevissen (1815-1899), showed themselves, in the United Diet, to be far removed from a Mirabeau (1749-1791) or a Lafayette (1779-1849). But this did not disturb Marx's or Engels' equanimity!

"Meanwhile, the German workers are well aware that the absolute monarchy, being as it is in the service of the bourgeoisie, neither can nor will hesitate to greet them with cannon-balls and with the cracking of whips. Why, then, should the workers prefer the brutal oppression of the absolute government with its semi-feudal train of followers, to the direct rule of the bourgeoisie? The workers are well aware that the bourgeoisie must not only make them far more extensive political concessions than the absolute monarchy; but also that the bourgeoisie, for the sake of its own commerce and industry, must willy-nilly bring into being the conditions which will unify the working class—and the unification of the workers is the first essential to their victory. The workers know that the abolition of bourgeois property relations will not be brought about by the maintenance of feudal conditions. They know that their own struggle with the bourgeoisie will not come to a head until the bourgeoisie has been victorious. But in spite of all this they do not share Herr Heinzen's bourgeois illusions. They can and must accept the bourgeois revolution as one of the essential conditions of the proletarian revolution. Not for a moment, however, can they regard the bourgeois revolution as their own final aim." (Marx, *Nachlass*, Vol. II, pp. 469-470.)

It is true that the German bourgeoisie lagged far behind the times, that it only began to struggle against the absolute monarchy and to consolidate its own political power at an epoch when in all other advanced countries the bourgeoisie had already entered upon a life-and-death struggle with the working class, and when Europe in general

had outgrown the political illusions of youth. Still, even in Germany, conflicts were already arising between the bourgeoisie and the working class. These conflicts were coming into the open, as was evidenced by the disturbances in Silesia and in Bohemia. Thus the German bourgeoisie and the German proletariat were at war in the economic field before the bourgeoisie in Germany had constituted itself as a class in the political arena.

The German bourgeoisie aimed, as far as possible, at converting the absolute monarchy into a bourgeois monarchy by peaceful methods, without having recourse to revolution. But this hope was an illusion; for the absolute monarchy had its roots in the bureaucracy and in the feudal order, both of which were faced by the problem, "to be or not to be." A bourgeois revolution was, therefore, inevitable.

Nevertheless, the communists should not for a moment curtail their own special work. They should not cease to educate the workers into a consciousness of the divorce of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, to point out that the struggle against the bourgeoisie must be entered upon immediately after the break-up of the absolute monarchy, to make it quite clear that the bourgeois revolution would be a prelude to the workers' revolution.

The authorship of this fourth chapter is usually ascribed to Engels, yet we need but compare the working of the Manifesto in regard to these tactics with Engels' formulation in his *Principles of Communism* to realise how difficult it was even for such a man as Engels to devise and to express suitable lines of action. Where Engels tells us that the communists must fight against the government on behalf of the party of the liberal bourgeois, Marx tells us that the communists are to go shoulder to shoulder with the bourgeoisie in so far as it shows itself revolutionary. Whereas Engels is content to strive for innumerable privileges thanks to which a bourgeois victory would also be a victory for the communists, Marx links up the bourgeois revolution in Germany (whereas it is taking place under far more advanced conditions than those of England and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries respectively) with the proletarian revolution, the former being, he contends, no more than the precursor of the latter.

That the communists did take into consideration the special conditions prevalent in Germany when the revolution broke out, is proved by the fact that they forthwith drew up a program of practical demands which differed in several points from the one put forward

in Chapter Two of the Manifesto. The program drawn up by the German communists is of particular interest to us even now, and I have therefore reproduced it as an appendix to the present volume.

One of the chief differences consists in the formulation of demands which, though to a very incomplete degree, had already been realised in the more advanced countries such as the United States, Switzerland, Great Britain, and France. In the absence of these essential reforms it would be impossible to create the social and political conditions which could serve the German workers as weapons in the fight against the bourgeoisie.

Items 1 to 6, and 12 and 13 sum up the general political demands, the realisation of which would transform Germany into a united, indivisible, democratic republic. The remaining items deal with demands concerning social and economic life. They correspond to the tenth point in the program put forward in the Manifesto, though they are somewhat more detailed, and diverge from the Manifesto in certain respects. These details and divergences are of peculiar interest to us, for we can gather from them how Marx and Engels would have formulated the same points had they not been constrained to introduce into the Manifesto all those demands which were either the outcome of collective deliberation or of compromise with the various trends of opinion in the London congress of the Communist League.

The practical experience of the German revolution quickly showed that where the bourgeoisie, in its own despite, is obliged to take part in the revolutionary movement against the absolute monarchy, it endeavours to enter into a compromise with the powers of the past, and it does so with redoubled speed if the party of the working class puts forward its demands with determination and decision. The demands which Marx and Engels devised in respect of Germany were enough to frighten the German bourgeoisie out of its wits! They were even too strong meat for the German democrats.

•63. COMMUNISTS AND DEMOCRATS

WE see, therefore (such is the gist of this passage), that in France, in Switzerland, in Poland, in any and every country, the communists should rally to the revolutionary activities of those who are waging the fight against extant social and political conditions; for, with each step along the road towards the emancipation of the oppressed working

folk the ground is being prepared for the class fight of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. But, in contra-distinction to the democrats, the communists, while taking part in these movements, do not place the question of monarchy or that of political rights at the head of their program. What they are primarily out to combat is private ownership, and the solution of this problem is a matter of life and death to the proletariat in so far as the destruction of bourgeois property relations is concerned.

Another item on the communist agenda, as outlined in the concluding chapter of the Manifesto, is the unification and collaboration of the democratic parties in every land.

It was for all these reasons that the Communist League endeavoured, by bringing communists and democrats together, to form a united front. Through the instrumentality of Marx, Engels, Wolff, etc., the League hoped to realise in all countries a union of democratic forces against feudalism and reaction. Yet such collaboration was not to mean a renunciation of the right to criticise the revolutionary phrasemongering and the illusions affected by these same democrats. The unifying trend found expression in such organisations as the International Democratic Association in Brussels (whose vice-president was Karl Marx), and the Fraternal Democrats in England. The latter body was dominated by the Chartists, and among its members were Schapper and other representatives of German communism living in London.

PART THREE

Appendixes

APPENDIX A

RYAZANOFF'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST RUSSIAN EDITION OF THE PRESENT VOLUME

THERE are several translations of the Communist Manifesto in the Russian language. Bakunin, Plekhanoff, Posse, Orloffsky, and others have all tried their hand at it. The best translation is Plekhanoff's. The founder of Russian Marxism made use of Bakunin's work, which had appeared in 1870, rectifying a few terminological errors, modernising the old-fashioned style, and modifying the Hegelianisms of the forties. Yet in spite of all its merits, Plekhanoff's translation cannot wholly be relied on, for there are some serious omissions, and he has taken not a few liberties with the original.

Instead, therefore, of making a fresh translation, I have used Plekhanoff's text, subjecting it to a careful examination, endeavouring as far as possible to leave the literary style intact; yet at the same time giving the text in full and doing my best to convey the real meaning of the original.

By the beginning of 1923, seventy-five years will have elapsed since the first publication of the Communist Manifesto. Nevertheless, as far as essentials are concerned, it is anything but obsolete. As with all historical documents, however, it "dates" to some extent, and cannot be fully understood except in relation to the historical epoch which gave it birth. Many events referred to in its pages are well-known historical happenings of an earlier day. But contemporary events, many of which have now been forgotten, were also made use of by Marx and Engels in illustration. For this reason the Manifesto needs a commentary.

Such a commentary would have to satisfy the following conditions. First of all, it would have to give the history of the social and revolutionary movement which called the Manifesto into life as the program of the first international communist organisation. Next it would have to trace the genesis, the source, of the basic ideas contained in the Manifesto, and would have to show their place in the history of

thought, would have to bring out that which was new in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, that which differentiated them from the thinkers who had gone before. In the third place, the commentary would have to indicate to what extent the Manifesto stands the test of historical criticism, and would have to amplify and correct it in certain points.

There have been several attempts to write such a commentary. Antonio Labriola, for instance, the Italian Marxist, penned an introduction¹ to the Manifesto and made a detailed study of the work. Unfortunately he has been so concise and so abstract in his treatment that in places he is more difficult to understand than the original document itself! The bourgeois socialist, Professor Charles Andler, has also written a commentary, but this is superficial and at times, positively trivial. It has appeared in Russian translation, and is suitable for use by the students in our Party schools.

For comrades who wish for a deeper understanding of the Manifesto, I would recommend the following books:

1. **ENGELS, *The Principles of Communism*.** This is written by one of the authors of the Manifesto, and may indeed be considered the original draft of that document in the form of question and answer. It is couched in very simple language. (See Appendix F.)

2. **MARX, *Wage Labour and Capital*,** with a preface by Engels.

3. **ENGELS, *Socialism—Utopian and Scientific*.** This was written at the close of the eighteen-seventies. It contains an examination of the results, the successes, and, above all, the theories of Marxian philosophy during the thirty years which had elapsed since the publication of the Manifesto.

Comrades will find in the various appendixes a number of notes, and a short chronological table of the chief events in the history of socialism and in the socialist movement down to the year 1848. I trust that these will facilitate the understanding of the Manifesto, and will be of value to our propagandists and to our lecturers in the Party schools.

APPENDIX B

RYAZANOFF'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND RUSSIAN EDITION OF THE PRESENT VOLUME

To clear up a misunderstanding, I wish to explain that the present work is not the commentary whose need I emphasised in the preface

to the first edition. It merely contains some notes and observations. the course of lectures which I gave at the Sverdloff University during 1919-1920, and that given at the Socialist Academy during 1921-1922, in which I dealt exclusively with the Communist Manifesto, showed me that, in the absence of explanations, and expeditions into the realm of the history of socialism and of the socialist movement, even those students at the Party schools who had had some training, found it difficult to appreciate to the full the mine of wealth contained in the Manifesto. But lectures are one thing, and written comment is another! The latter needs much preliminary work of a painstaking kind, for without this many of the propositions in the Manifesto would be insufficiently elucidated—especially in those cases where the traditional explanation proves inadequate on closer investigation.

Scientific communism, as it was first enunciated in the Manifesto, cannot be understood without a knowledge of its historical precursors—the history of socialist philosophy and the development of the proletarian class struggle since the epoch of the great French revolution. Only by a study of the origins of the working-class movement and of socialist theory during the early decades of the nineteenth century shall we be enabled to realise what in the Manifesto was newly contributed to that theory by Marx and Engels. For the Manifesto, inasmuch as it gave a program to the whole international working-class movement, itself became an international factor in the history of socialism. True, it happens to be written by two men of German birth. But we shall never be able to understand the document if we think of it merely as the product of persons of a specific nationality. Marx and Engels were far more than that. They had an intimate acquaintance with English and French history, and could (with even more justification than Lassalle) say that they were armed with a thorough knowledge of the general history of their epoch. Thus the Manifesto has an international significance, marking, as it does, not only a distinct stage in the development of socialist thought, but likewise a stage in the development of thought in general, and acting as the starting-point of a new era in the history of culture. A commentary on the Manifesto should give a full account of its history and should follow up all the ideas contained in it to the source whence they sprang. Some day, such a commentary will have to be written—at the cost of an immense amount of preliminary labour.

For this reason, when I was asked to write a commentary to

the Manifesto, I demurred, and could undertake no more than to provide a minimum of explanatory details.

This second edition differs from the first in the following respects. (1) Acting on the advice of Comrade S. Vasilchenko, and with his help, the numbered notes have been furnished with captions. (2) As introduction, I have supplied a short history of the Communist League. Here I mainly quote Engels, but I also introduce matter based upon my own investigations. A detailed critique of the views of Engels (1820-1895), Mehring (1846-1919), Grunberg (b. 1861), Meyer (1839-1899), and others, concerning the history of the Communist League will be given later on in a special work from my pen.

Engels' brilliant article, *The Revolutionary Movements of 1847* (republished by myself in 1911, and here printed as an Appendix) first appeared in the "Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung" on January 23, 1848, at the very time when Marx was putting the finishing touches to the Communist Manifesto. This article serves two purposes. It gives an admirable summary of the revolutionary movements which were agitating Europe in the year 1847; and is likewise an illuminating commentary on the concluding section of the Manifesto, the one entitled "Attitude of the Communists Towards the Various Opposition Parties." Among the appendixes the reader will also find a translation of Engels' *Principles of Communism*, which constituted the first draft of the Communist Manifesto. In conjunction with the article on the revolutionary movements of 1847, this question-and-answer pamphlet gives us an opportunity of determining the part Engels played in the composition of the Manifesto.

I have added two further appendixes: a translation of the trial number of the "Kommunistische Zeitung" which appeared a few months before the issue of the Manifesto; and the Rules and Constitution of the Communist League.

I hope that these additions, together with the notes, may to a certain extent serve the purpose of a commentary to the Manifesto, and may provide fresh material for the teachers in our Party schools and our communist universities.

November, 1922.

APPENDIX C

PREFACES TO VARIOUS EDITIONS

1. AUTHORS' PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1872

THE Communist League was an international association of workers. Owing to the conditions obtaining at that date, the League was necessarily a secret organisation. At a congress held in London during November, 1847, the League commissioned us to write for publication a party program which should state in detail both the theory and the practice of communism. Such was the origin of the following Manifesto, the manuscript of which found its way to a London printer a few weeks before the outbreak of the February revolution. The work was originally published in German, and subsequent editions in the same tongue were issued in Germany, England, and the United States of America. There were no fewer than twelve of these German editions. Not until the year 1850 did it appear in an English translation by Miss Helen Macfarlane in the columns of the "Red Republican." At least three different translations were issued in the United States during the year 1871. The French version appeared in Paris shortly before the June insurrection of 1848, and has recently been re-issued by "Le Socialiste" of New York. Another French translation is now in course of preparation. A Polish version appeared in London soon after the publication of the original German. A Russian translation was issued at Geneva in the sixties. It was done into Danish shortly after its first appearance in German.

Though conditions may have changed in the course of the twenty-five years since the Manifesto was written, yet the general principles expounded in the document are on the whole as correct to-day as ever. A detail here and there might be improved. As is stated in the Manifesto, the practical application of the principles will depend everywhere and at all times upon extant historical conditions. We therefore do not lay any special stress upon the revolutionary measures suggested at the close of the second section. In many respects the passage would have to be differently worded to-day. In view of the huge development of large-scale industry during the last quarter of a century and the concomitant growth in the party organisation of the working class; in view of the experience gained in the course of the February revolution and still more in view of the practical knowledge

acquired during the two months' existence of the Paris Commune when the proletariat held political power for the first time; in view of all this, the program has, to a certain extent, become out of date. Above all, the Commune of Paris has taught us that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes." (This point is further developed in *The Civil War in France*, an Address by the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association.

Moreover, the criticism of socialist literature contained in the Manifesto must on the face of it be very incomplete at the present moment seeing that we could, at the time of writing, deal only with what had been published down to 1847. Again, although in principle our remarks concerning the relationship of the communists to the opposition parties (see section four) are still valid, yet in practice they have become obsolete owing to the complete change in the political situation and because in the course of historical development most of the parties mentioned in the text have been swept from off the face of the earth.

Meanwhile, the Manifesto itself has become a historic document which we do not feel we have any right to alter. In a subsequent reprint we may deem it advisable to add an introduction which shall bridge the gap from 1847 to the present day. But this reprint was sprung upon us so suddenly that we had no time to write such an introduction just now.

KARL MARX.
FRIEDRICH ENGELS.

London, June 24, 1872.

2. ENGELS' PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1883

THE preface to this new edition must, alas, be signed with my name alone. The man to whom the whole working class owes more than to any other lies in Highgate cemetery and the grass is already encroaching on his grave. Since Marx's death,¹ the idea of rewriting or of changing anything in the Manifesto can no longer be entertained. It seems, therefore, all the more essential that I should here repeat certain statements:

The basic thought underlying the Manifesto is as follows: the

* Marx died in London on March 14, 1883.

method of production, and the organisation of social life inevitably arising therefrom, constitute in every historical epoch the foundation upon which is built the political and intellectual history of that epoch; consequently (ever since the disappearance of the communal ownership of land) the whole of man's history has been the history of class struggles, incessant warfare between exploited and exploiter, between oppressed classes and ruling classes at various stages in the evolution of society; the struggle has now reached a stage of development when the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) cannot free itself from the dominion of the exploiting and ruling class (the bourgeoisie) without at one and the same time and for ever ridding society of exploitation, oppression, and class struggles.

Marx, and Marx alone, was the originator of this fundamental thought.¹

I have stated this fact many times already; but it is essential that it should now find a place in the foreword to the Manifesto itself.

London, June 28, 1883.

3. ENGELS' PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF 1890²

SINCE I wrote the above yet another German issue of the Manifesto has become necessary. Besides, certain things have happened in the history of that document which it may be well to record.

A second Russian translation—by Vera Zasulich³—appeared at

¹ This thought (as I wrote at a later date in the preface to the English translation) is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology. We had both of us been gradually approaching the idea for some years prior to 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it, is best shown in my *Condition of the Working Class in England*. When I again met Marx, in Brussels during the spring of 1845, he had it worked out in all its details, and laid it before me in terms almost as precise as those in which I have stated it here.

² The main portion of this preface is a retranslation of Marx's and Engels' preface to the Russian version, which was written in January, 1882.—*Translators' Note.*

³ Engels is at fault! The Russian version published at Geneva in 1882 was made by Plekhanov, not by Vera Zasulich. Bakunin's translation had appeared in 1870. The preface to the Plekhanov edition was penned a few months after Alexander II's assassination.

The organisation known as Narodnaya Volya [People's Will, consisting of declared terrorists] was at the height of its popularity in those days. Alexander III,

Geneva in 1882. The preface to that edition was written jointly by Marx and myself. Unfortunately, I have mislaid the original German, and shall have to retranslate from the Russian version. Naturally the text will not improve in the process! Still, here is what we wrote under date, January 21, 1882:

"The first Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, in Bakunin's translation, was published early in the sixties by the printing firm of the "Kolokol." At that date, a Russian issue of the Manifesto could have very little significance in the West save as a literary curio. To-day, such an outlook is no longer possible. When, in January, 1848, the Manifesto made its first appearance in the world, the proletarian movement was confined to a limited field of operations. This is plainly shown in the last section, which is entitled: Attitude of the Communists towards the various Opposition Parties. There is no mention either of Russia or of the United States in the section—noteworthy omissions. At the time when the Manifesto was composed, Russia constituted the last great bulwark of European reaction, and the United States absorbed, in the form of countless emigrants, the surplus of the European proletariat. Both countries provided Western Europe with raw materials, and simultaneously, both countries served as markets for the sale of European manufactured goods. Both, therefore, in one way or another, were pillars of the European social order.

"What a change has taken place since then! European emigration has promoted the unprecedented growth of agriculture in North America, which in its turn, by becoming a competitor of European agriculture, has shaken the landed interests of Europe (great and small alike) to their very foundations. Again, the development of farming in the United States has made it possible to exploit the vast industrial resources of the country so effectively that, before long, American competition will put an end to the monopoly hitherto exercised by Western Europe in the realm of industry. These two courses of evolution react in their turn upon the United States, tending to

second son of the assassinated emperor, shut himself up in his palace at Gatchina and put off indefinitely the date of his "solemn coronation." Not until the years 1883-1884 did it become evident that the greatest triumph of the Narodnaya Volya involved its ruin, that the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in Europe proved to be (as far as its native land was concerned) no more than a vanguard without a main army to support it, and therefore incompetent to carry on the heroic struggle against Russian tsardom.—D.R.

force that country likewise into revolutionary paths. More and more do the small and medium-sized farms, the warp and woof of the whole political system, tend to be submerged by the competition of large-scale undertakings. Simultaneously in the field of industry, we are witnessing the emergence of a multitudinous proletariat and a fabulous concentration of capital.

Let us now take a trip to Russia. At the time of the revolutionary wave in 1848-1849, the European bourgeoisie, no less than the monarchs, looked upon Russian intervention as the only salvation from the proletariat, which was for the first time becoming aware of its own strength. The tsar was acclaimed as leader of the European reaction. To-day he sits in his palace at Gatchina, a prisoner of the revolution, and Russia has become the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in Europe.

"The Communist Manifesto was a proclamation wherein the inevitable disappearance of present-day bourgeois property relations was heralded. In Russia, alongside the capitalist system (which is growing up with feverish speed) and the bourgeois landowning system (which is in its early stages of development), more than half the land is owned in common by the peasantry.

"The question we have to answer is: Will the Russian peasant communes (a primitive form of communal ownership of land which is already on the down grade) become transformed into the superior form of communist ownership of land, or will they have to pass through the same process of decay we have witnessed in the course of the historical evolution of the West?

"There is only one possible answer to this question. If the Russian revolution sounds the signal for a workers' revolution in the West, so that each becomes the complement of the other, then the prevailing form of communal ownership of land in Russia may serve as the starting-point for a communist course of development."

At about the same date as the publication of the above-mentioned Russian translation, there appeared (likewise in Geneva) a new version in the Polish language. The title ran: Manifest Komunistyczny.

Further, a fresh translation into Danish has been done and has been issued by the Social Democratic Library of Copenhagen (1885). Unfortunately the work is incomplete. Certain essential passages (which seem to have puzzled the translator) have been omitted. In

addition there are signs of carelessness here and there, which are all the more to be regretted seeing that the translation gave promise of being an excellent one had the translator taken a little more pains.

A new French version appeared in the Paris newspaper "Le Socialiste" in 1886. This is the best to date.*

Somewhat later in the same year a Spanish translation was published in "El Socialista" of Madrid. It was then re-issued in pamphlet form under the title: *Manifiesto del Partido Comunista por Carlos Marx y F. Engels*, Madrid, Administracion de El Socialista, Hernan Cortes, 8.

As a matter of interest I may mention that in 1887 an Armenian version was offered to a publisher in Constantinople. That worthy had not the courage to issue a work bearing the name of Marx as author. He suggested that the translator himself should assume the responsibility of authorship. This, however, the latter refused to do.

Meanwhile, a succession of more or less inaccurate translations made in the United States have found their way to the printers' in England, and have passed into circulation. At length, in 1888, an authorised version appeared. This was done by my friend Moore, and we revised it together before sending it to the printer. It is entitled: *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Authorised English translation, edited and annotated by Frederick Engels, 1888. London, William Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, E.C. Some of the notes added to this English edition have been transferred to the present German re-issue.

The Manifesto has had a history of its own. Greeted with enthusiasm at the date of its first appearance by the little handful of those who constituted the advance-guard of scientific socialism (as is shown by the quick succession of translations mentioned in the first of our prefaces), it was soon forced into the background by the reaction which followed upon the defeat of the Parisian workers in June 1848. Later, as the result of the trial of the communists at Cologne in November 1852, it was banned. The workers' movement, which had surged upwards as a consequence of the revolutionary upheaval of the February days, passed into the back ground, and the Communist Manifesto followed in its wake.

When the European workers, with energies renewed, again rose

*It was the work of Laura and Paul Lafargue.

to attack the power of the ruling class, the International Workingmen's Association came into being. The aim of this Association was to gather all the fighting forces of labour into one huge army, to bring all the workers of Europe and America together. Such an organisation could not set out from the principles laid down in the Manifesto. It had to have a program of its own which should leave the door open for the entry of British trade unionists, of French, Belgian, Italian, and Spanish Proudhonists, and of German Lassallists* alike. Such a program—the basis for the Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association—was compiled by Marx. Even Bakunin and the anarchists were forced to acclaim it as the work of a master hand. As for the theories contained in the Manifesto, Marx relied entirely upon the intellectual development of the workers to ensure their final triumph. Schooled by united action and by discussion, the workers would gradually come to understand and to adopt these theories. Experience gained in the ups and downs of the struggle against capitalism, in defeat even more than in victory, would teach the combatants the worthlessness of the panaceas they had hitherto advocated, and would make their minds more receptive to a thorough understanding of the real conditions of working-class emancipation. Marx was right. When, in 1874, the International Workingmen's Association petered out, the working class was altogether different from what it had been at the date of the birth of the International ten years earlier. Proudhonist theories in Latin countries, and Lassallist theories in Germany had had their day. Even the hide-bound conservatism of the British trade unions had been modified to so great an extent that, in 1887, at the Swansea Congress, the chairman could say: "Continental socialism has lost its terrors for us." Yet by that date continental socialism had become the almost complete embodiment of the principles laid down in the Manifesto. Thus, to a certain extent, the history of the Manifesto is the history of the modern working-class movement since 1848. For the nonce, this document is undoubtedly the most widely circulated, the most international product, in the field of socialist literature; it is the common

* Lassalle never hesitated to describe himself as a "disciple" of Marx. Thus, it goes without saying, that he accepted the teachings of the Manifesto. His followers, however, do not go beyond his scheme of co-operatives for production, supported by State credits. Thereby the whole working class is divided into the advocates of State aid and the champions of self-help.

program of many millions of workers in all lands ranging from Siberia to California.

Nevertheless, when it first appeared we could not call it a Socialist Manifesto. In 1847 there were two kinds of persons who would fain pass by the name of socialist. First of all there were the adherents of various utopist systems. Notable among these were the Owenites in Britain and the Fourierists in France. Even at that date they had dwindled, and were no more than decaying sects. In the second place, we had the various types of social quacks who guaranteed the extirpation of social ills by means of cure-alls and tinkering, without in any way tampering with the interests of capital and profit. Both these groups were composed of persons outside the ranks of the labour movement who hoped to find supporters among the "cultured" classes. The section of the working class which was convinced that political changes were not enough, but that there needs must be a complete change in the structure of society—that section laid claim to the title of communist. It was a somewhat crude and rough-hewn kind of communism, and purely instinctive. Yet it was sturdy enough to bring into being two systems of utopian communism—in France, the "Icarian" communism of Cabet, and in Germany the communism of Weitling. In 1847, socialism was a bourgeois movement, whereas communism was working class. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, quite respectable, whereas communism was the very opposite. Since, already at that date, we were wholly convinced that "the emancipation of the workers must be the task of the working class itself," we could have no hesitation as to which of the two words we should choose. Nor has there ever been any inclination on our part to repudiate our first choice.

"Proletarians of all lands, unite!" Few were the voices to respond when we launched these words into the world forty-two years ago on the eve of the revolution in Paris when, for the first time, the proletariat arose and fought for its own interests. On September 28, 1864, the proletariat of wellnigh every land in western Europe joined hands in the International Workingmen's Association of glorious memory. The International survived for only nine years. Nevertheless, the union that organisation created will live for all time; it is to-day stronger than ever. Indeed, events are showing this to the full. As I write these lines, the proletariat of Europe and of America is holding a review of its forces; it is mobilised for the first time as One army, marching forward under One flag, and fighting for One immediate

aim: an eight-hour working day,* established by legal enactment (as was demanded by the Geneva Congress of the International Workingmen's Association, and again by the International Socialist Congress held at Paris in 1889). The spectacle we are now witnessing will make the capitalists and landowners of all lands realise that to-day the proletarians of all lands are, in very truth, united.

If only Marx were with me to see it with his own eyes!

London, May 1, 1890.

4. ENGELS' PREFACE TO THE POLISH EDITION OF 1892

THE need for a fresh edition of the Polish version of the Communist Manifesto calls for comment.

First of all, the Manifesto has become, as it were, a means for gauging the development of large-scale industry in Europe. As, in this country or that, large-scale industry develops, there arises at the same time among the workers engaged in industry a desire to understand their relationship as a class of those who live by labour, to the class of those who live by ownership. In these circumstances, socialist ideas spread among the workers, and the demand for the Manifesto increases. Thus, by the numbers of the Manifesto circulated in a given language, we are able to estimate with a fair amount of accuracy, not only the condition of the working-class movement in that land, but also the degree of development which large-scale industry has attained.

The demand for a fresh edition in the Polish tongue, is, therefore, an indication of the continuous expansion of Polish industry. There is no doubt whatever as to the importance of this development during the course of the ten years which have elapsed since the publication of the previous issue. Poland has now become a region of large-scale industry under the ægis of the Russian State.

Whereas in Russia proper, large-scale industry has appeared no more than sporadically (on the shores of the Gulf of Finland, in the central provinces of Moscow and Vladimir, along the coasts of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov), Polish industry has been concentrated within the confines of a restricted area, and has reaped both the advantages and the disadvantages of the situation. The advantages are not ignored by Russian manufacturers, and they therefore demand protective tariffs against Polish wares—in spite of their ardent desire

to Russianise the Poles! The disadvantages (and these affect the Polish manufacturers equally with the Russian government) consist in the rapid spread of socialist ideas among the Polish workers and in the unprecedented demand for the Manifesto.

The speedy growth of Polish industry (far outstripping that of Russia), is a clear indication of the inexhaustible vital energy of the Polish people and a fresh guarantee of its future renaissance. The creation of a strong and independent Poland is not of importance to the Polish people alone but to each and every one of us. Close collaboration among all the workers of Europe is only possible if in each land the people is master in its own house. The revolutions of 1848 which, under the banner of the proletariat, merely led the workers to the fight in order to make them pick the chestnuts out of the fire for the advantage of the bourgeoisie, ultimately, through the instrumentality of Napoleon and Bismarck (the enemies of the revolution), brought about the independence of Italy, Germany, and Hungary. But Poland, which had done more for the revolutionary cause in 1791 than these three countries put together, was left to fight a lone hand when, in 1863, she was crushed by the tenfold stronger power of Russia.

The Polish nobility was not able to maintain and has not been able to establish the independence of Poland. The bourgeoisie is becoming less and less interested in the question. Polish independence can only be won by the young proletariat of Poland, in whose hands lies the fulfilment of this hope. The workers of western Europe are, therefore, no less interested in the liberation of Poland than the Polish workers themselves.

London, February 10, 1892.

5. ENGELS' PREFACE TO THE ITALIAN EDITION OF 1893

THE publication of the Manifesto of the Communist Party coincided (if I may say so) with the outbreak of revolutions in Milan and Berlin, revolutions which were uprisings of two peoples: one living in the heart of the continent of Europe; the other dwelling on the shores to the Mediterranean Sea. Until that time these two peoples had been rent by internal strife and civil wars, and had thus fallen a prey to foreign rule. Just as Italy was subjected to the dominion of

the Emperor of Austria, so was Germany no less under the yoke of the tsar of all the Russias, though this tsarist domination was less obvious. The revolution of March 18th freed both Italy and Germany from this shameful state of affairs. If subsequently, from 1848 to 1871, these two great nations allowed the old conditions to be restored, and to a certain extent "played traitor to themselves," this was because (as Karl Marx expressed it) the very people who had inspired the revolution of 1848 became, in their own despite, its executioners.

Everywhere the revolution was the act of the working-class: the workers built the barricades; the workers gave their lives in the cause. The Parisian workers alone, however, after overthrowing the government, had the firm and definite intention to overthrow likewise the whole bourgeois regime. But although they were well aware of the irreconcilable antagonism between their own class and the bourgeoisie, the economic development of the country and the intellectual development of the French labouring masses had not as yet reached the stage when a socialist revolution was possible. In the end, therefore, the fruits of the revolution fell into the hands of the capitalist class. In other countries, such as Italy, Austria, and Germany, the workers from the very outset of the revolution merely helped the bourgeoisie to seize power. The rule of the bourgeoisie, in every land, could only come into being under conditions of national independence. Thus the revolutions of the year 1848 inevitably led to the unification of the peoples within the national frontiers and to their emancipation from a foreign yoke—conditions which, hitherto, they had not enjoyed. Such conditions have been realised in Italy, in Germany, and in Hungary. Poland will follow suit when the time is ripe.

In spite of the fact that the revolutions of 1848 were not socialist revolutions, they have nevertheless prepared the way for the coming of the socialist revolution. As an outcome of the mighty impetus given by these revolutions to the growth of large-scale production in every land, bourgeois society has during the last forty-five years created a vast, united and powerful proletariat, and has thus given birth (as the Communist Manifesto expresses it) to its own gravediggers. While the various countries lacked national unity and independence, and while each country worked in isolation, the international unification of the proletariat could never have been achieved, nor would the sober and deliberate collaboration of these countries in the furtherance of

general aims have been possible. Try to imagine if you can, the activities of Italian, Hungarian, German, Polish, and Russian workers taking an international turn under the political conditions prevailing down to the year 1848!

The battles fought in 1848 were thus not fought in vain. Nor have the forty-five years which separate us from that revolutionary epoch been lived in vain. The fruits of those days are beginning to ripen, and my desire is that the publication of this Italian translation may be a good omen for the victory of the Italian proletariat, just as the publication of the original text was the herald of the international revolution.

The Manifesto gives full due to the revolutionary service which capitalism has rendered in the past. Italy was the first to become a capitalist country. The close of the feudal Middle Ages, the dawn of the contemporary capitalist epoch, saw a colossal figure appear upon the scene. Dante was at one and the same time the last poet of the Middle Ages and the first poet of the new era. To-day, as in 1300, a new epoch is beginning to shape itself. Will Italy give the world another Dante who will be able to portray the birth of the new, the proletarian era?

London, February 1, 1893.

APPENDIX D

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS OF 1847

By FRIEDRICH ENGELS*

THE year 1847 was the most stormy we have experienced for a very long time. A constitution and a United Diet have been granted to Prussia; an unexpected and rapid awakening in the political consciousness of the people and a widespread arming against Austria have taken place in Italy; civil war has broken out in Switzerland; a decidedly radical parliament has been elected in Great Britain; France is alive with sensational happenings and indulging in banquets given in honour of the reforms; the United States of America are celebrating their recent victory over Mexico. Here we have an array of changes and of movements such as had not been experienced for many a day.

* This article was published in the "Deutsche Brüsseler Zeitung" on January 23, 1848, and was reprinted in the "Neue Zeit," 1911.

The last turning point in history was the year 1830. The July revolution in France and the passing of the Reform Bill in Great Britain had placed a seal upon the victory of the bourgeoisie; as far as Great Britain was concerned, this was the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie, the manufacturers, over the non-industrial bourgeoisie, the landed gentry. Belgium, and to a certain extent Switzerland, soon followed suit; here again the bourgeoisie registered a triumph. There were uprisings in Poland, Italy groaned under Metternich's heel. Germany was seething. All lands were preparing for a mighty struggle.

Then came a set-back. The Polish revolution was crushed, the insurgents in Romagna were quelled, the upward surge in Germany was suppressed. The French bourgeoisie conquered the republicans in France itself, and betrayed the liberals of other lands whom it had spurred on to action. In Great Britain, the liberal ministry could only mark time. By the year 1840, reaction was safely in the saddle. Politically speaking, Poland, Italy, and Germany were dead: the Berlin political newspaper, the "Wochenblatt," sat enthroned in Prussia; Herr Dahlmann's all-too-clever constitution was overthrown in Hanover; the decisions of the Vienna Conference (1834) were in full force. The Conservatives and the Jesuits had gained the upper hand in Switzerland. In Belgium, the Catholics were at the helm. Guizot ruled supreme over France. In face of the growing power of Peel, the Whig regime was in its last throes, and the Chartists were vainly endeavouring to reorganise their ranks after the defeat of 1839. Everywhere, reaction was victorious; everywhere, the progressive parties were broken up and dispersed. The total result of the mighty struggles of 1830, was to erect a barrier which blocked the further advance of the historical movement.

Just as 1830 had been the high-water mark of the bourgeois revolutionary upheaval, so was the year 1840 the spring tide of reaction. From 1840 onward the revolt against the existing state of affairs can be witnessed. Though more than once repulsed, in the long run the movement gained ground. In Great Britain, the Chartists reorganised themselves and became stronger than ever, so that Peel was forced time and again into betrayal of his party, dealing it a fatal blow by the abolition of the Corn Laws. In the end, he was compelled to resign. The radicals gained ground in Switzerland. In Germany, and especially in Prussia, the liberals were pressing their

demands with ever-increasing vigour. The liberals came out victorious in the Belgian elections of 1847. France was an exception, for there the reactionary ministry secured a triumphant majority in the 1846 elections; but Italy remained dead to the prevailing resurgence, until Pius IX mounted the papal throne, and in 1846 conceded a few dubious reforms.

Such was the state of affairs at the outset of the year 1847, a date at which the progressive parties could register a whole series of victories in the political arena. Even where they sustained defeat, this was probably more advantageous in the circumstances than an immediate victory would have been.

Nothing decisive was achieved during 1847, but in the course of those twelve months the parties everywhere came to stand out sharply and clearly one from the other; no problem was solved, yet every problem came to be put in such a way that a solution was now possible.

Among all the events and changes which took place during 1847, those which happened in Prussia, in Italy, and in Switzerland were the most important.

Frederick William IV had at length been forced to grant a constitution to Prussia. The sterile Don Quixote of Sans-Souci had, after long labour and much groaning, been delivered of a form of government which was to establish for all time the victory of the feudalism, patriarchal, absolutist, bureaucratic, and clerical reaction. But he miscalculated. The bourgeoisie was strong enough by this time to turn the new constitution to account and use it as a weapon against the king and all the reactionary classes of society. In Prussia, and in other lands, the bourgeoisie embarked on a policy of refusing supply. The king was in despair. In the early days of the application of this new policy, it would be no exaggeration to say that Prussia had no king for the time. The country was in the throes of revolution without any one being aware of the fact. By a stroke of good luck, fifteen millions came to hand from Russia, and Frederick William once more became king. Thereupon the bourgeoisie crumpled up in alarm and the clouds of the revolutionary storm were scattered. The Prussian bourgeoisie was, for the time being, defeated. But it had made a great step forward, had created a forum whence it could make itself heard, had given the king an inkling of its growing power, and had worked the country up into a great state of excitement. The question which is now agitating Prussia is: who shall govern? Is it to be an alliance of

nobles, bureaucrats, and priests, with the king at the head; or is it to be the bourgeoisie? A decision must be made one way or the other. In the United Diet a compromise between the two parties was still possible; to-day such a compromise is no longer practicable. Henceforward there will be a life-and-death struggle between the opponents. To make matters worse, the committees (those unhappy inventions of the Berlin constitution manufacturers) are now assembling. These gatherings will make the already complicated legal issues so enormously more involved, that no one will henceforward be able to find an exit from the maze. They will tie matters up into a Gordian knot which the sword alone will be competent to sunder. They will make the final preparations for the bourgeois revolution in Prussia.

We can therefore await the advent of this Prussian revolution with the utmost calm. The United Diet will have to be summoned in 1840 whether the king will it or not. Till that day dawns we will give His Majesty a breathing space; but not a moment longer. Then will his sceptre and his "unimpaired"* crown have to yield place to the Christian and the Jewish bourgeois of his realm.

In spite of a temporary retreat, the Prussian bourgeoisie did very well in the sphere of politics during the year 1847. The bourgeois, great and small, of the other German States have noted this progress in Prussia and shown the most heartfelt sympathy. They know that a victory of their brethren in Prussia spells their own victory as well.

As for Italy, here we are faced by an amazing spectacle. We see the man who is recognised as the most reactionary in the whole of Europe, who is regarded as the petrified representative of the ideology of the Middle Ages, we see the pope himself, taking the lead in a liberal movement! The movement grew to power in a night, ousting the Austrian archduke from Tuscany and with him the traitor Charles Albert of Sardinia, destroying the throne of Ferdinand of Naples, and sweeping onward in mighty waves across Lombardy to the foot of the Tyrolese and Styrian Alps.

To-day the movement in Italy resembles that which took place in Prussia during the years from 1807 to 1812. As in Prussia of those days, the contest rages around two aspirations: independence as far as foreign dominion is concerned; and reforms at home. For the moment there is no question of a constitution; all that the Italians demand is administrative reforms. Any serious conflict with the government is to be avoided so as to show a united front as possible

in face of the foreign overlord. What kind of reforms are being asked for? Whom are they likely to advantage? In the first place they will advantage the bourgeoisie. The newspaper press will be favoured; the bureaucracy will be handled in such a way that it will serve the interests of the bourgeoisie (cf. the Sardinian reforms, the Roman consulta, and the reorganisation of the ministries); the bourgeois will be granted an extension of powers in regard to communal administration; the arbitrary privileges of the nobles and of the bureaucracy will be restricted; and the bourgeoisie, in the guise of civil guards, will be armed. Hitherto all the reforms that have been introduced have been favourable to the bourgeoisie. Indeed they could not be otherwise. We need but compare present day reforms in Italy with those introduced into Prussia during the Napoleonic era in order to be convinced of this fact. To-day they are the same, except that they are a little more thoroughgoing, for they have made the administration subservient to the interests of the bourgeoisie, they have broken the arbitrary power of the nobility and the bureaucracy, they have established a system of municipal self-government, have inaugurated a militia, and have abolished the corvée. As of yore in Prussia, so to-day in Italy, the bourgeoisie has become the class upon which the liberation of the country from a foreign yoke depends. The bourgeoisie has risen to this position owing to the growth of its wealth as a class, and, in especial, owing to the important part which industry and commerce play in the life of the people as a whole.

In Italy, we see that at the present moment the movement is wholly bourgeois in character. All the classes now inspired with a zeal for reform, from the aristocracy and the nobility down to the street musicians and the beggars, are for the nonce nothing other than bourgeois, and the pope himself is the First Bourgeois in Italy. But on the day when the Austrian yoke has finally been thrown off, all these classes will be greatly disillusioned. Once the foreign enemy has been completely overcome by the bourgeoisie, then the separation of the sheep from the goats will begin; then the aristocracy and the nobility will turn to Austria for aid. Too late! The workers, likewise, the workers of Milan, of Florence, of Naples, will realise that for them the real work is only now beginning.

Finally, let us turn our eyes to Switzerland. For the first time in course of its history, this country has played a definite part in the European State system, for the first time it has ventured to assume a decisive attitude, has entered the arena as a federal republic instead

of as heretofore an agglomeration of two-and-twenty antagonistic cantons. By putting down the civil war with a ruthless hand, the supremacy of a centralised power has been assured. In a word, Switzerland is now a centralised State. The centralisation which exists for all practical purposes will of course have to be legalised by the reform of the federal constitution now in process of revision.

Who, we may ask, is going to profit by the outcome of the war, by federal reform, by the reorganisation of the secessionist cantons [those that had formed the Sonderbund]? The bourgeoisie and the peasantry, of course; the victorious party, the party of the liberals and radicals which from 1830 to 1834 had won to power in individual cantons. The patriciate which had been dominant in the sometime imperial towns had been completely overthrown during the July revolution. In Berne and in Geneva, patricians had reinstated themselves, but were once more routed from their strongholds by the revolution of 1846. In the towns (as for instance Basle City) where the patriciate had as yet remained undisturbed, the year 1846 was to shake the patrician domination to its foundations. A feudal aristocracy had not developed to any considerable extent in Switzerland; where it had taken root it found its chief strength in an alliance with the herdsmen of the uplands. These men were the last enemies remaining for the bourgeoisie to conquer, and they proved to be the most obstinate and the most rabid of them all. They were the blood and bone of the reactionary elements in the liberal cantons. Aided by the Jesuits and the pietists (see the movement in the canton of Vaud), they covered the whole of Switzerland with a network of reactionary conspiracies. They thwarted all the plans laid before the federal assembly by the bourgeoisie, and hindered the final defeat of the patriciate in the erstwhile imperial cities.

Not until 1846 was it possible for the Swiss bourgeoisie to give the quietus to this last of its foes.

In almost every canton, the Swiss bourgeoisie had been able to do pretty well what it liked in the matter of commerce and industry. In so far as the guilds still existed, they did little to hamper bourgeois development. Town dues had been practically abolished. Wherever the bourgeoisie had developed into a specific class, it had seized political power. But although it had made good progress in certain cantons and had found support there, the main pillar of power was still lacking, namely centralisation. Whereas feudalism, patriarchalism, and

parochialism had flourished upon the soil of separate provinces and individual towns, the bourgeoisie needed for its growth as wide a field of operations as possible; instead of twenty-two cantons it needed a one and undivided Switzerland. Cantonal sovereignty, which had suited the conditions in Old Switzerland, had become a crushing handicap for the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie needs a centralised power, strong enough to impose a particular course of development upon each and every canton, and, by sheer weight of influence, to cancel the discrepancies in the constitution and the laws of the land. The vestiges of the feudal, patriarchal, and parochial burgher legislation had to be wiped out, and the interests of the Swiss bourgeoisie had to find vigorous expression in the internal life of the country.

The bourgeoisie has won for itself such a centralised power.

But did not the peasants lend a hand in overthrowing the Sonderbund? Certainly they did! So far as the peasantry is concerned, it will play the same part towards the bourgeoisie that it played for so long towards the petty burgherdom in the past. The peasants will now be exploited by the bourgeoisie, they will fight the battles of the bourgeoisie, their hands will weave the cloth and make the ribbons which the bourgeoisie will sell, their sons will be the recruits to fill the ranks of the proletarian army. What other course could they take? They are owners, like the bourgeois, and for the moment their interests are almost identical with those of the bourgeoisie. The political measures which they are strong enough to put through, are far more advantageous to the bourgeoisie than to the peasants themselves. Nevertheless, they are weak when compared with the bourgeoisie, because the latter is wealthy, and has control of industry, which is the pivot of political power in the nineteenth century. Acting together with the bourgeoisie, the peasantry can achieve much; acting against the bourgeoisie, the peasantry can achieve nothing.

Doubtless a time will come when the peasant, uprooted from his native fields and impoverished, will join hands with the proletariat, whose evolution has run far ahead of that of the peasantry. Then, together, the peasant and the proletarian will declare war upon the bourgeoisie. But we are not concerned here with the future eventuality.

The expulsion of the Jesuits and their consorts, those opponents of the bourgeois order, the introduction of secular instruction in the schools to replace the old-time religious education, the seizure of most

of the Church lands by the State—all these changes have been favourable, above all, to the bourgeoisie.

A common factor in the three most noteworthy movements of the year 1847 is that each one of them served the interests of the bourgeoisie. The party of progress was, everywhere, the party of the bourgeoisie.

Another characteristic of the events of 1847 is that those countries which did not participate in the upheavals of 1830 were precisely the ones to take so decided a step forward at the later date, thus rising to the heights attained by other lands as early as 1830. They have, in their turn, achieved the victory of their bourgeoisie.

We thus see that the year 1847 registered some brilliant successes for the bourgeois class as a whole.

Let us now turn elsewhere.

In England a new parliament has assembled, a parliament which, in the words of John Bright the Quaker, is the most bourgeois gathering ever held. John Bright is the best authority in the matter, seeing that he himself is the most typical bourgeois in the whole of Great Britain. But John Bright is of a different calibre from the bourgeois statesmen who now rule France or those who mouthed such brave words against Frederick William IV in Prussia. When John Bright speaks of a bourgeois he means a manufacturer. Ever since 1688, various sections of the bourgeois class have held dominion in Great Britain. But, in order to facilitate the process of the seizure of power, the bourgeoisie has allowed the aristocrats, its debtors, to retain their nominal hold on the governmental machine. Whereas, in reality, the struggle in Britain is between sections of the bourgeoisie, between manufacturing interests and land-owning interests, the manufacturers are able to make the struggle appear to be one between aristocracy and bourgeoisie or, if needs must, as a struggle between the aristocracy and the people. Manufacturers have nothing to gain by maintaining even an appearance of aristocratic governance, for the lords and the baronets and the squires do not owe the industrialists a farthing. On the other hand, they have much to gain by the destruction of the shadow power of the aristocracy, for with the disappearance of this shade, the landowning interests will be deprived of their sheet-anchor. The present bourgeois or manufacturers' parliament will see to it that this shadow rule is destroyed. It will change the old-fashioned, feudalist England into a more or less modern land organised to serve modern

bourgeois interests. It will bring the British constitution into line with those of France and of Belgium. It will achieve the victory of the British industrial bourgeoisie.

Another advance on the bourgeois front; for every advance of the bourgeoisie brings about an extension and a strengthening of bourgeois rule.

France would appear to be an exception to this forward movement of the bourgeois class. The dominion which fell into the hands of the whole of the great bourgeoisie in 1830, suffered curtailment year by year, till it was confined to the wealthier sections of the great bourgeoisie, the idle rich and the speculators on the Stock Exchange. The latter have bent the majority of the former to their will. The numbers of the bourgeoisie who have resisted these encroachments, a section of the manufacturers and the shipowners, are steadily diminishing. This minority has now made common cause with the middle and petty bourgeoisie in demanding electoral rights, and the alliance is being acclaimed at so-called reform banquets. They despair of ever coming into power so long as the extant system of election continues in force. After long hesitation, they have made up their minds to promise a share of political power to the sections of the bourgeoisie next below themselves in the scale of importance, the ideologists (most innocuous of mortals), to lawyers, doctors, and so forth. Naturally enough, the day is still far distant when such promises can be carried into the realm of reality.

Thus, in France, we see a struggle in progress which, as far as Britain is concerned, has wellnigh been settled. But, as always in France, events assume a more definitely revolutionary character than elsewhere. This division of the bourgeoisie into two distinct and hostile camps, also marks an advance for the bourgeois class.

In Belgium the bourgeoisie registered a decisive victory in the elections of 1847. There the Catholic ministry was forced to resign, and the liberal bourgeoisie is now at the helm of State.

We have witnessed the defeat of Mexico by the United States, and have been duly rejoiced. That too is an advance. For when a country which has hitherto been wrapped up in its own affairs, perpetually rent with civil wars, and completely hindered in its development, a land whose best prospect had been to be industrially subject to Britain—when such a country is forcibly dragged into the historical process, we have to look upon the new departure as a step forward.

In the interests of its own development, Mexico should be placed under the tutelage of the United States. The evolution of the whole continent of America will profit by the fact that the United States will, by the possession of California, have command of the Pacific. Again we may ask: "Who is going to profit by the war?" And again we answer: "The bourgeoisie, and the bourgeoisie alone." The United States have acquired the new regions of California and New Mexico for the creation of fresh capital. This means that a new bourgeoisie will arise in these lands, and that the old bourgeoisie will acquire more wealth. All capital created to-day flows into the coffers of the bourgeoisie. And what about the proposed cut through the Tehuantepec peninsula? Who is likely to gain by that? Who else than the United States shipping magnates? Rule over the Pacific, who will gain by that but these same shipping magnates? The new customers for the products of industry, customers who will come into being in the newly acquired territories—who will tend to their needs? None other than the United States manufacturers.

Here again, then, we see that the bourgeoisie has made good progress. Yet the representatives of that same bourgeoisie are now entering a protest against the war. Why? Because they fear that the advance may, in various ways, cost them too dear.

Even in quite barbarous lands the bourgeoisie is advancing. In Russia, industry is developing by leaps and bounds and is succeeding in converting even the boyars into bourgeois. Serfdom is being made less stringent both in Russia and in Poland. Thereby the bourgeoisie will be strengthened at the nobles' expense; a free peasantry will arise; and this is precisely what the bourgeoisie is in need of. The Jews are being persecuted—in the interests of the Christian bourgeois whose business is spoiled by Jewish pedlars. The Hungarian feudal magnates are changing into cornchandlers, wool merchants, and cattle dealers. They now enter the Landtag in the character of bourgeois. What of all these glorious advances of "civilisation" in such lands as Turkey, Egypt, Tunis, Persia, and other barbarian countries? They are nothing else but a preparation for the advent of a future bourgeoisie. The word of the prophet is being fulfilled: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord. . . . Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the king of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory?" The bourgeois!

* Wherever we cast our eyes, we see that the bourgeois is making

stupendous progress. He is holding his head high, and haughtily throws down the gauntlet to his foe. He expects a decisive victory, and his hopes will not be frustrated. He intends to organise the whole world according to bourgeois ideas; and, for a considerable portion of the earth's surface, he will succeed in his purpose.

We are no friends of the bourgeoisie. That is common knowledge! But we do not grudge the bourgeoisie its triumph. We can chuckle over the haughty looks which the bourgeoisie deign to bestow (especially in Germany) upon the tiny band of democrats and communists. We are not opposed to the bourgeois' determination to spread their methods over all the earth.

Nay more. We cannot forbear an ironical smile when we observe the terrible earnestness, the pathetic enthusiasm with which the bourgeois set to work. They really believe that they are working in their own behalf! They are so short-sighted as to fancy that through their triumph the world will assume its final configuration. Yet nothing is more likely than that they are preparing the way for us, for the democrats and the communists; than that they will only have a few years wherein to enjoy the fruits of victory and will then be overthrown. Everywhere the proletariat stands at their rear; in Italy and in Switzerland participating in their struggles and partly sharing in their illusions; in France and in Germany, silent and reserved, but nevertheless preparing the downfall of the bourgeoisie; in Britain and in the United States, in open rebellion against the ruling bourgeoisie.

We can do more. We can lay all our cards on the table and tell the bourgeoisie just what is in our minds. They may as well know beforehand that they are working in our interests. They cannot cease their fight against the absolute monarchy, the nobility, and the priesthood. They must conquer—or die here and now.

Before very many days have gone by they will be appealing to us for aid in Germany.

Continue to struggle bravely forward, most worshipful masters of capital! We need you for the present; here and there we even need you as rulers. You have to clear the vestiges of the Middle Ages and of absolute monarchy out of our path; you have to annihilate patriarchalism; you have to centralise administration; you have to convert the more or less owning classes into genuine proletarians, into recruits for our ranks; by your factories and your commercial relation-

ships you must create the material means which the proletariat needs for the attainment of freedom. In recompense whereof we shall allow you to govern for a while. Dictate your laws, bask in the rays of the majesty created by yourselves, spread your banquets in the halls of kings, and take the beautiful princesses to wife—but do not forget that

“The Executioner stands at the Door!”

FRIEDRICH ENGELS.

APPENDIX E

(Translated from the German original)

[TRIAL NUMBER]

Communist Journal

"PROLETARIANS OF ALL LANDS, UNITE!"

No. 1

London, September, 1847.

Price 2d. .

We request all those who sympathise with our undertaking and who are living abroad to send articles and subscriptions to this journal to The Workers' Educational Society, 191, Drury Lane, High Holborn, London. Subscription rates: for Germany, 2 Silbergroschen or 6 Kreuzer; for France and Belgium, 4 sous; for Switzerland, 1½ batzen.

CONTENTS:—Introduction.—Cabet's Scheme of Emigration.—The Prussian Diet and the Proletariat in Prussia in particular and in Germany in general.—The German Refugees.—Political and Social Survey.

Introduction

THERE are thousands of newspapers run off the presses day by day; every political party, every religious sect has its mouthpieces; the proletariat alone, that vast multitude of persons who possess nothing, has hitherto found it impossible to run a permanent organ of its own, one that shall defend the interests of the working class, one that can serve the workers as a guide in their endeavour to educate themselves. Not that the need for such an organ has not been felt by proletarians. Indeed, attempts have been made in one place or the other to establish suitable newspapers of the kind.—Always in vain. In Switzerland, following close upon one another's heels came the "Junge Generation," the "Frohliche Botschaft", the "Blatter der Gegenwart"; in France we had "Vorwaerts" and "Blatter der Zukunft"; in Prussian Rhine-

land, the "Gesellschaftsspiegel"; and so on. All of them were ephemeral. Either the police took a hand and scattered the staff; or the necessary money was not forthcoming, for the proletariat had not the wherewithal and the bourgeoisie would not help. In spite of these misadventures, we have been asked again and again to make a further venture into the realm of newspaper production, seeing that here in England freedom of the press prevails and that we need have no fear of police interference.

Both intellectuals and manual workers promised their collaboration. Yet we hesitated, for we dreaded lest after a very short period of activity, publication would cease for lack of funds. It was finally suggested that we acquire a printing press of our own so as to give the venture a more stable foundation. A subscription list was opened, and the members of both the workers' educational societies in London did everything in their power to swell the fund. Nay, they did even more than seemed possible, and in a short time the sum of £25 was collected. The money permitted us to have the necessary type brought over from Germany; our compositor members have set up this issue gratuitously; and here in actual fact is the first number of our paper, whose existence is assured if we can get a little further help from the Continent. We still lack a printing press, but as soon as we have the money we intend to purchase one. Then our printing establishment will be in a position, not only to run off our newspaper, but likewise to print the pamphlets necessary for the defence of the proletariat. Since we are determined to be cautious, we shall content ourselves for the present with sending out this trial number, and shall await the response from abroad before proceeding to print anything more. We hope that towards the close of the year a satisfactory response will be forthcoming. Then we shall have to decide whether the journal is to be issued weekly or fortnightly. The London readers alone are almost sufficient to guarantee a monthly issue. Provisionally the price of each copy is fixed at two pence, four sous, two silbergroschen, or six kreuzers, as the case may be. As soon as we have two thousand subscribers, we shall be able to reduce the price.

And now, Proletarians, the matter is in your hands. Send us articles, become subscribers if you possibly can, win over readers for the paper wherever an opportunity presents itself. The journal is to champion a holy, a righteous cause, the cause of justice against injustice, the cause of the oppressed against the oppressors. We stand for truth

and against superstition and falsehood. We work for no recompense, for no pay: we are merely acting as in duty bound. Proletarians, do you wish to be free? Then rouse up from your slumbers and join hands one with another! Mankind expects every man to do his duty.

PROLETARIANS!

Since the origin and meaning of the word we apostrophise you with may not be known to many among you, we will prelude our articles by a short explanation.

When the Roman State was at the zenith of its power, when it had reached the climax of its civilisation, its citizens were divided into two classes: owners and non-owners. The owners paid direct taxes to the State; the non-owners gave the State their children. The latter were made use of to protect the wealthy and were condemned to drench innumerable battlegrounds with their blood, in order to increase the power and the property of the owning class. "Proles" is the Latin for children, for offspring. Proletarians, therefore, constituted that class of citizens who owned nothing but the arms of their body and the children of their loins.

Contemporary society is approaching the highest point of its civilisation, machines have been invented, great factories have been erected, property is more and more becoming concentrated into the hands of a few individuals, and, consequently, the proletariat has likewise developed and increased in numbers. A few privileged individuals own all the property there is to own, whilst the broad masses of the people possess nothing but their hands and their children. Just as of old in the Roman State so now do we see proletarians and their sons thrust into military uniforms, trained to become automata which protect the very persons who oppress them, the persons at whose nod their blood is to be shed. Just as of old, so now, must the sisters and the daughters of the proletariat be sacrificed to the bestial lusts of rich voluptuaries. Just as of old, so now, is hatred rife against the oppressors. Nevertheless, the proletarian of our own day is in a much better position than was his Roman brother. The Roman proletariat had neither the means whereby it could win to freedom, nor the education that could guide it on its way; nothing remained for it but to rise in revolt, to revenge itself, and to die defeated. Many a proletarian to-day has attained a high degree of education thanks to the development of book printing; others, by endeavour and by uniting their forces, are daily acquiring knowledge. Whilst the proletariat is ever

aspiring to loftier altitudes, is ever seeking for greater solidarity, the privileged class is setting an example of the most flagrant selfishness and most detestable immorality. Civilisation to-day has at its command enough means wherewith to make all members of society happy. The aim of the modern proletariat is, therefore, not merely to destroy, to wreak revenge, to find freedom in death. On the contrary, the proletariat must act in such a way that a society shall be established wherein all mankind can live as free and happy creatures. In contemporary society, the proletarians are those who can have no capital to live on, worker and professor, artist and petty bourgeois alike. Even though the petty bourgeois may still possess a little property, nevertheless he soon falls into the ranks of the proletariat, a victim of the fierce competition of large-scale capital. He can, therefore, already be counted as one of ourselves, for it is quite as much to his better interest to guard against a condition of complete destitution as it is for us to rise out of this condition. Let us unite; unity cannot fail to advantage us both.

The aim of this journal is to work on behalf of the emancipation of the proletariat, and to make it possible for the proletariat to call upon all the oppressed to close their ranks in solidarity.

We have christened our paper the "Communist Journal", because we are convinced and know that this emancipation can be secured in no other way than by a complete transformation of extant property relations. In a word, the liberation of the oppressed can only be achieved in a society based upon common ownership. We had contemplated introducing into this issue a short and easily comprehensible profession of communist faith. Indeed, the draft is already written. But since this profession of faith will have to serve as a guide in our future propaganda activities and is, therefore, of the utmost importance, we considered it our duty to submit the draft to our friends abroad in order to profit by their views in the matter. As soon as we receive replies we shall make the necessary emendations and additions, and shall print it in our next issue.

The communist movement is so universally misunderstood, when it is not intentionally calumniated and its teaching distorted; that we may suitably saw a few words about it, in so far as we know its aims, and ourselves are taking part in its activities. Here it behoves us mainly to state what communism is not if we are to put an end to the libellous accusations which might be uttered against us.

We are no quack-mongers advocating a system that shall be a cure-all. Experience has taught what folly it is to discuss and elaborate the details of a future society, and to ignore all this means which might help us to achieve our aims. That philosophers and professors should spend time upon excogitating the organisation of a future society is a good thing and has its uses; but if we were to set ourselves in full earnest to discuss with our fellow proletarians as to how the workshops of the future State were to be inaugurated, how the future community of goods was to be administered, what was the best cut for the wearing apparel of the future, and how we should most conveniently clean the closets, we should make ourselves a laughing-stock and should quite justly deserve to be called unpractical dreamers—a name so often applied to us without reason. Our generation has its task to perform, which is to find and to assemble the building materials needed for the erection of the new edifice. It will be up to the next generation to do the work of construction, and we may rest easy that when the time comes master builders will not be lacking.

We are not among those communists who believe that our goal can be won by the exercise of love alone. No salt sad tears are wept by us in the moonlight deploring the misery of mankind, our profound depression being followed by an ecstasy of delight at the thought of a golden future. Our day is one of earnest endeavour, it needs the whole of each man's exertions. This love-and-sob stuff is nothing more than a kind of mental self-ennervation which deprives those addicted to it of all capacity for energetic action.

We are not among those communists who preach ever-lasting peace here and now what time our opponents in every land are girding their loins for battle. We know only too well that, with the possible exceptions of Britain and the United States, we shall not be able to enter our better world unless we have previously and by the exercise of force won our political rights. Should there still be persons to condemn us and to call us revolutionists, we can only shrug our shoulders in disdain. No dust is going to be thrown in the eyes of the people by us. We mean to tell the people the truth, to warn the people the approaching storm, so that all preparations can be made in advance. We are not conspirators who have determined to begin the revolution on such and such a day or who are plotting the assassination of princes. But neither are we patient sheep who shoulder their cross uncomplainingly. We know that, on the continent of Europe, the discord between aristocrat and democrat cannot be resolved

without a clash of arms—indeed, our enemies are well aware of this, too, and are making warlike preparations. It is incumbent on each and every one of us to make ready so that we may not be taken by surprise and destroyed. A final and serious struggle lies ahead of us. If our party comes out of it victorious then will the day have dawned when we can for ever lay our weapons on the shelf.

We are not among those communists who believe that a community in goods can be established, as if by magic, on the morrow of a victory. We know that mankind advances, not by leaps, but only step by step. We cannot pass from an inharmonious society to a harmonious one betwixt night and morning. A transitional period will be needed, longer or shorter as circumstances may dictate. Only by degrees can private property be transformed into social property.

We are not among those communists who are out to destroy personal liberty, who wish to turn the world into one huge barrack or into a gigantic workhouse. There certainly are some communists who, with an easy conscience, refuse to countenance personal liberty and would like to shuffle it out of the world because they consider that it is a hindrance to complete harmony. But we have no desire to exchange freedom for equality. We are convinced, and we intend to return to the matter in subsequent issues, that in no social order will personal freedom be so assured as in a society based upon communal ownership.

Thus far what we are not. In our profession of faith we shall declare what we are and what we aim at achieving. Here we have only to address a few words to those proletarians who belong to other political or social parties. We are all of us out to fight extant society, because it oppresses us and allows us to rot in poverty and wretchedness. Instead of realising this and uniting our ranks, we are prone, alas, to squabble among ourselves, to fight with one another—much to the delight of our oppressors. Instead of, like one man, putting our hands to the work in order to establish a democratic State wherein each party would be able by word or in writing to win a majority over to its ideas, we wrangle one with another as to what will or what will not happen when once we have been victorious. We cannot help but recall in this connection the fable of the bear hunters, who, before ever they had caught sight of a bear, came to fisticuffs as to who should become owner of the bear-skin! It is more than time that we should lay aside our enmities and join hands in mutual protection. If we are to achieve solidarity, the spokesmen of the various parties

must cease their bitter attacks upon those who hold other views and must put an end to the abuse showered upon the adherents of opposing theories. We respect all, even aristocrats and priests, who have opinions of their own; and are prepared to defend, persistently and resolutely, what they believe to be right. But those who, behind the mask of this or that religion or of this or that political or social party, have no other object in view than the advantage of their own filthy selves, will receive no quarter from us. All men of honour are in duty bound to unmask such hypocrites, to expose them in all their loathsome nakedness to the world. Any one can make a mistake and champion false doctrines. But we must think no worse of him for that, if he himself believes in them and is true to his colours. Hence Carl Heinzen is exceeding his rights when he attacks the communists as he does in the second issue of the "Tribun." Either Carl Heinzen is completely ignorant of the meaning of communism, or he has allowed his personal antagonism to certain communists to prejudice his judgment of a party which stands in the front ranks of the armies fighting for democracy. When we read his attack on the communists we were filled with amazement. His accusations did not touch us on the raw because such communist as he describes simply do not exist. They have probably been created by Heinzen's vivid imagination in order that he may then proceed to take cock-shies at them. When we say we were amazed at his article we mean that it was hard for us to believe that a democrat could have been guilty of throwing the apple of discord into the midst of his own comrades-in-arms. But our astonishment waxed even greater when, at the close of the article we read his 9 points which were to form the bases of the new social order. These points are almost identical with the demands put forward by the communists! The only difference would appear to be that Citizen Carl Heinzen looks upon his nine points as the bases of the new social order, whereas we would look upon them merely as a foundation for the transitional period which shall prelude the inauguration of a fully communised society. It is, therefore, reasonable to hope that we shall become united in order to achieve what Carl Heinzen proposes. Once having got so far, if we find that the people is content, is so perfectly satisfied that it would fain go no farther, we shall have to submit to the popular will. But should the people wish to go forward until communism is established, we do not suppose that Citizen Heinzen would raise any objections. We are well aware that Citizen Heinzen is the object of attack and calumny on the part of our common oppressors, and is, therefore, in a state of acute irritability. We, our-

selves, will in no way molest him. On the contrary, we will not refuse to extend the hand of solidarity towards him. Unity is strength; unity alone can lead us to the goal.

Therefore proletarians of all lands unite—openly where the laws permit, for our activities need not fear the light of day—secretly where the arbitrary will of tyrants imposes secrecy upon us. So-called laws which forbid men to meet together in order to discuss the problems of the day and to demand their rights are not laws in the true sense, they are no more than the peremptory decisions of tyrants. He who pays heed to such laws and observes them is a coward and acts dishonourably; but he who scorns them and breaks them is a man of courage and honour.

A word in conclusion. The columns of our journal are not open for the ventilation of personal grievances or for the commendation of those who perform their duty. When, however, a proletarian is oppressed and ill-used, he need but turn to us and we shall wholeheartedly rally to his aid, and make widely known the name of the oppressor so that public opinion may curse the miscreant as he deserves. Even the most stiff-necked tyrant trembles before public opinion.

Citizen Cabet's Emigration Scheme

Citizen Cabet has issued an appeal to the French communists wherein we read: "Since we are persecuted not only by the government, the priests, and the bourgeoisie, but even by the revolutionary republicans as well, since we are calumniated and driven from pillar to post in so irksome a manner as to make it difficult for us to gain a livelihood or to maintain our physical and moral integrity, let us shake the dust of France from off our feet and journey to Icaria." Cabet imagines that from twenty to thirty thousand communists are ready to follow his call, and, in another continent, to found a communist colony. He has not yet made it clear what destination he has in view, but we may assume that his choice will single out one or other of the free states of North America. Maybe he has Texas in mind; or perhaps California, so recently conquered by the Americans, is the land of his predilection.

We are glad to recognise, as all communists must recognise, the indefatigable zeal, the amazing persistence with which Cabet fights in the cause of suffering humanity; nor do we fail to give him credit

for the successful issue of his work. Further, he has done inestimable service by his warnings in respect of those who plot and scheme against the proletariat. Nevertheless we cannot allow matters to pass unnoticed when, in our view, Cabet enters upon a false path. We respect Citizen Cabet personally, but we feel it essential to oppose his emigration plan. Nay more; we are convinced that should his plan ever materialise it would bring contumely upon the principles of communism and serve as a triumph for the government, so that Cabet's last days would be embittered by a terrible disappointment.

Here are the grounds for our opinion.

1. We believe that when in any country the most shameless corruption comes to be looked upon as a matter of course, when the people is basely exploited and oppressed, when right and justice are no longer held in honour, when society is disappearing in anarchy as is the case in France at the present day, it is up to every champion of justice and of truth to remain in that country, to enlighten the people to inspire the weak with fresh courage, to lay the foundations of a new social order, and to face the foe with a bold heart. If decent, honest men, fighters for a better world, leave the country and abandon the field to obscurantists, cheats, and rogues, then will Europe inevitably fall upon evil days, and poor humanity will have to go through another century of suffering by fire and sword. Yet Europe is precisely that quarter of the earth's surface where the community of goods could most easily be introduced.

2. We are convinced that such a scheme as Cabet proposes, *i.e.*, the founding of a colony, an Icaria, in America, wherein community of goods shall be in force, is impossible of accomplishment at the present time.

- (a) In the first place, because those who, together with Cabet, would emigrate to the new settlement, though they be zealous communists, are nevertheless tainted by their upbringing with all the faults and prejudices of contemporary society, and will not be able suddenly to discard these failings on arriving in Icaria.

- (b) Secondly, at the very outset, quarrels and friction will inevitably arise among the members of the colony precisely on account of these educational blemishes. Such misunderstandings will be utilised by the members of society at large, which is powerful and antagonistic to the experiment, and likewise by the European governments through the intermediation of their spies: these inimical forces will

foment the trouble until the whole little communistic society becomes completely disintegrated.

(c) Thirdly, most of the emigrants are likely to be artisans, whereas what is needed out there above all are sturdy men of the plough, men who shall furrow the soil and make it fruitful. It is not so easy a task as some seem to fancy, to convert an industrial worker into a land worker.

(d) Fourthly, the privations and the sicknesses which a change of climate entail will discourage many and prompt them to back out of the experiment. At the moment, many favour the plan because they can only see its rosy side, they have accepted it with enthusiasm. But when they are faced with rude reality, when privations of every sort fall to their lot, when all the little amenities of civilisation are withdrawn (amenities which even the poorest European worker sometimes has at his command), then many who are now so keen will find their enthusiasm replaced by overwhelming discouragement.

(e) Fifthly, it is impossible for a communist to envisage the inauguration of a society based on the community of goods without its having first passed through a period of transition, and indeed a democratic period of transition, during which personal property would gradually become merged into social property; for communists recognise the principle of personal freedom (as, probably, do the Icarians, likewise). A leap, such as Cabot contemplates, in the sequence of events is as impossible from a communist outlook as, from a farmer's outlook, would be a harvest when there has been no seed-time.

3. The failure of a scheme such as Cabot has in mind, although it would not annul the communist principle or make the practical inauguration of communism impossible, nevertheless would sap the courage of many communists, causing them to leave our ranks, and thereby in all probability dooming the proletariat to yet further decades of wretchedness and poverty.

4. Lastly, the community of goods cannot be established and maintained among a few hundred or a few thousand persons, without the little society becoming exclusivist or sectarian in character. An example is furnished us by Rapp's experiment in America. It is certainly not our intention, nor we believe the intention of the Icarians, to set up any community on Rapp's lines.

Nor have we yet had to suffer persecutions such as the Icarians, if they keep up intercourse with the outer world, will probably have to :

suffer at the hands of their American neighbours. We would advise every one who is contemplating emigration with Cabet to America to read a report of the persecutions which the Mormons, a religious sect based upon communist principles, have had to endure and are still enduring.

Such are the reasons why we consider Cabet's emigration plan a harmful undertaking. We appeal to the communists in every land: Brothers, let us man the breach here, in old Europe; let us remain here to work and to fight; for in Europe alone are all the elements ready for the establishment of a society based on the community of goods. Such a society will be inaugurated here if it is ever going to be inaugurated anywhere at all.

The Prussian Diet & the Prussian Proletariat, together with the Proletariat throughout Germany

Ever since 1815 the bourgeoisie in Germany has been fighting the feudal landowners and the system of absolute monarchy (a system based upon "rule by the grace of God"). The issue between the rival factions has been, Which shall hold sway? Such a struggle has been made unavoidable by the development of industry and commerce in other lands—a growth which is going on in Germany likewise, though Germany limps slowly and modestly after her neighbours. New conditions necessitate new forms. The bourgeoisie, aware of its growing power, a power which is based upon capital and free competition, could no longer tolerate the role of silent and submissive onlooker. But a speedy victory was impossible, not only on account of the constitutional paucity of courage in the hearts of the German bourgeoisie, but to a far great degree owing to the division in its ranks and lack of solidarity. Germany is cut up into thirty-eight States, hostile to and often jealous of one another. In these circumstances the bourgeoisie endeavoured, now in this tiny German fatherland, now in the other, by isolated action, to gain the goal of its desires. Here and there the bourgeoisie succeeded so far as to bring into being so-called constitutions, and to attain to more or less effective parti-

cipation in the governmental and administrative activities of the various realms. Concessions to the bourgeoisie, however, did not get much beyond the paper stage, for the system of "rule by God's grace" continued in force as heretofore, and the decisive word was still with the landed aristocracy and the bureaucracy upon whose alliance the absolute monarchy depended.

The supremacy of such rule was assured because the bourgeoisie lacked unity, conducted its activities in isolation, made individual onslaughts; whereas its opponents were united in the utmost solidarity, willingly followed the leadership of the arch-roogue Matternich, and by this solidarity were able to triumph over all resistance and ward off every attack. The German Bundestag [federal assembly in Frankfort], composed as it is of the creatures and hirelings of the German princes, served merely to destroy all that the bourgeoisie had temporarily achieved in this that German State. The "father" of the country concerned could thus hypocritically assume an attitude of unwonted liberality, saying that for his part he would have liked to grant all demands and to carry out all his promises. Unfortunately the Bundestag would not permit him to act according to the dictates of his heart. His country was too small and too weak to venture on opposition to mighty Prussia and to mighty Austria. One must bow the head to necessity—a circumstance he himself deplored. All the time our worthy "father" of his country was laughing up his sleeve.

The political movement now afoot in Prussia is, consequently, of extreme importance. Prussia, with her sixteen million inhabitants, is a factor to be reckoned with, must throw more weight in the scale of decisions, and must therefore be of far greater importance than, let us say, a German State numbering no more than four or three million or even (as in the case of the principality of Liechtenstein-Vaduz) so few as six thousand souls. Prussia's population of sixteen millions wields greater influence than the total population of twenty-eight millions belonging to the other thirty-three States, because the latter are divided up into as many disintegrated groups. Every victory of the bourgeoisie in Prussia spells victory for the bourgeois forces among the remaining twenty-eight million inhabitants of Germany. If the Prussian bourgeoisie is able to sweep the cobwebs, the whimsies out of the brain of the Most Christian King in Potsdam and bring him ruthlessly to heel, the bourgeoisie throughout Germany will be given a free hand. Then will the absolute rule of the Bundestag be broken. Gradually the whole of the German bourgeoisie will join hands, and the

masters "by God's grace" and the masters of feudal land tenure will be told to go the devil. In the future these gentry will only have a standing in so far as they become representatives of the bourgeoisie and members of the bourgeois class.

Let us cast a glance at the activities of the Prussian Diet. The course of events in the White Hall of Berlin makes clear the present position of parties in Prussia. They also bring into relief the import of the political movement in Prussia for the whole of Germany to-day. The experiences of the Diet will be better understood if we first of all give an account of the circumstances which called it into being. How was it that king in Potsdam at length consented to a measure which from the day of his accession until the most recent times he had opposed so wrathfully and with such great determination? Had not the Prussian newspapers every time they endeavoured to prove the necessity of calling the estates of the realm, every time they had recalled the king's promises of twenty years earlier, seen their articles mercilessly cut or deleted by the censor? Was not any attempt at openly expressing the demand to summon the estates of the realm treated as a treasonable offence? Yet now, of a sudden, the ruler in Potsdam has himself become a traitor, gives the lie to his own past, and does what he so proudly and so often assured us he would never do? What is driving him to this contradiction?

The treasury is empty, and it cannot be refilled without the help of the estates of the realm! In spite of the fact that peace had lasted for three decades, in spite of the revenue increasing year by year, in spite of the heavy burden of taxation which the people had to furnish by its labour, there was not a stiver left in the coffers of the State. Tremendous demands were made upon the State finances by the amazing extravagance of the king and his court, by the ruinous expenditure upon the military arm, by shamelessly high pensions granted to officers (who already enjoyed a tidy income) and to persons in the civil service, and by the incompetence and wastefulness of the whole administration. The king and his ministers sought to remedy the evil by every possible means. Their efforts were of no avail. The plan concerning the royal bank, the most recent endeavour to repair the financial deficit, was only partially successful and served merely as a temporary relief. The Prussian government found to its horror that after just as before the plan was put into execution its credit stood at zero. Alas, a couple of lines in a wretched law passed in 1820 were so phrased that a capitalist, be he home-bred or foreign, would indeed

have a bee in his bonnet were he to advance a single copper to the Prussian administration so long as that law of 1820 remained a dead letter!

His Most Christian German Majesty was, at last, forced to issue the "patent" of February 3rd. The wording of this document was so cunning and so artfully contrived as to give the impression that the absolute monarch was going to grant what was essential without in any way impinging upon the power he had hitherto wielded. With this end in view there was to be created, on the one hand, the so-called "all-highest" administrative agenda which was arranged in advance and handed to the members of the Diet as though they were a pack of schoolboys; whilst on the other hand, the curia of nobles, a marvellous contraption, was set up. This curia of nobles was composed of more or less feeble-minded, wealthy, and proud princes of the blood royal, and a number of the bigger landowners, the most aristocratic and, consequently, the most reactionary and the most despicable of rogues. Such a body was in flagrant contradiction with the objects of the earlier law, and was merely created in order to act as a break upon the activities of the second curia. Even in the second curia, feudalist landed proprietors were excessively represented, for it had graciously pleased His Majesty in his wisdom to hurl all the other eight provincial estates helter skelter together in order to form the second curia. A pitiable electoral law had seen to it that the remaining members of the second curia were to a minimal extent chosen from among the intelligent and energetic ranks of the bourgeoisie. Further, Mr. Frederick William hoped that by assuming a harsh and overbearing tone in his speech from the throne he might browbeat those members of the Diet who were competent to arouse pricks of conscience in this "paternal" government. Having made all his preparations, Mr. Frederick William wrapped himself up in smug self-complacency. He felt that he was going to witness the fulfilment of all that he desired. He was sure that he would be granted supply, and that the money would re-establish the credit of his government. "Once I have bagged fifty to a hundred millions and my standing with the capitalists is restored, I shall be able to send these worthy young deputies to their homes and shall be in no hurry to summon them again. I shall get along with the aid of committees; they will serve my turn admirably. Bribing six hundred deputies is a deucedly expensive affair. It will come out cheaper if I have merely to do with a small number of persons sitting on a committee. Orders, money, flattery, and so forth, all of them

means which a Christian government may well make use of, will not fail to create a favourable impression. Armed with money and with credit, my kingly prerogative will remain unimpaired. I shall be able to gratify my wishes and fancies in heaven's name, and shall, as heretofore, fleece my loyal subjects to my heart's content." Thus spake Potsdam ruler to the circle of his intimates. What was the Diet's answer?

It refused every demand for money, turned down the proposals for the founding of agricultural banks, would not agree to the launching of a loan for the construction of the railway from Berlin to Königsberg, and finally declared that the government would not be voted supply until the rights which had been curtailed by the patent of February 3rd had been restored, the estates summoned at regular intervals, a detailed account rendered of all State expenditure; in a word, the Diet would not budge until the idiotic palaver about "by the grace of God" had been done away with for ever, and its place taken by constitutional procedure. A similar fate was shared by the bill proposing the abolition of the taxes on flour and bees, and the introduction of a graduated income tax. This decision was due partly to the grievances enumerated above and partly to the unwillingness of the wealthier deputies to shoulder any heavier financial burden for the benefit of the State. A great many members of the curia of nobles participated in the refusal. Among those who entered a protest we find the names of the wealthiest princes of the blood royal (as, for instance, Prince Albrecht) and of the most blue-blooded landowners in the kingdom. Further, a goodly number of deputies registered a refusal because they were only too well acquainted with the brutality, the arrogance, and the shameless tyranny of the Prussian bureaucracy, because they knew that so long as the bureaucracy could function in independence of the bourgeoisie and flaunt the livery of "the grace of God," the introduction of an income tax would mean fresh arbitrary inquisitions reaching into the very heart of the burgher's home.

In view of all these facts it was to be expected that the Diet would be extremely careful to insist on obtaining what it had so often and so definitely claimed as the rights of the estates. Yet nothing of the sort happened. Just before July 26th, which was the date for the closure of the session, the king's reply was made known. The Potsdam monarch granted a few of the demands made by his "loyal" estates, told them that other claims of a more important nature would have to be postponed until he had had time to consider them, while yet others were left entirely unnoticed. Finally, as concerned the com-

mittees—that all-important point—he ordered that these should, as prescribed in the rescript of February 3rd, be elected forthwith.

What did the estates do? They obeyed! A few of the deputies, those representing the Rhine province, Silesia, and so forth, remained faithful to their principles and refused to take any part in the election of the committees; others participated in the election under protest while putting in a plea for their rights; the remainder voted like servile lackeys of His Most Christian German Majesty.

The constitutional pusillanimity of the German bourgeoisie (to which we referred above) was largely to blame for this shameful retreat. The fortitude of many members of the liberal opposition was put to a hard test; these stalwarts found their courage oozing out of their boots, they did a right about turn, and slunk away. The treachery and perfidity of other deputies worked havoc likewise. Among these we find the names of some who were reckoned the ablest spokesmen of the liberal cause. Herr von Auerswald, for instance, who had often before, especially in connection with the petition for the freedom of the press (now completely given the go-by!) proved himself to be a political cheat and rogue. When we take the whole composition of the Diet into consideration and realise how great a preponderance of feudal magnates and officials there were even in the second curia, when we add to this the influence of flattering words uttered at the royal table and all the other cajoleries of a court, then we need no longer be surprised at the debacle of the new body.

And yet, be the results never so paltry and the delight of the government party never so great, achievement will soon become more worthy and the joy of the reactionaries be turned to grief. For the deputation concerning the national debt, and the "committees," are now in a position where they can no longer render those services to the government which the committees were especially intended to perform. They dare not trample the rights of the estates under foot. Public opinion would be against them. Even in the unlikely eventuality that the majority of the deputation and of the committees should favour the government and thus outvote the liberals, the absolute monarchy would not be one whit better off. No capitalist would be such a simpleton as to hand over his money to the government after all that had taken place in the Diet, after all the warnings of the opposition, and so long as the latter of the law of the land is not fulfilled. Should he nevertheless lend his money, he would only have

himself to blame if, before he knew where he was, all his demands were cancelled out—and that full legally forsooth!

The question of money is the main bone of contention in all these skirmishes. Since the monarchy has not enough money and is in urgent need of it, the bourgeoisie is in a favourable position to insist on its demands being granted. The throne might appear as strong as ever it was; nevertheless the waves of the modern spirit are at work undermining its foundations and it is doomed to fall. The importance of the Prussian Diet is not to be judged by the declarations made by Mr. Frederick William in his closing speech. The importance of its work lies in the fact that, during the eleven weeks' session, public opinion grew apace. Had the Diet not come into existence, such a development of public opinion would have taken years to accomplish. For the first time in Prussia there was open strife between the bourgeoisie and its two immediate foes, the bureaucracy and the absolute monarchy; in the struggle these two enemies received some hard knocks and suffered so decisive a defeat that in a very short time the vanquished would have to surrender to the victor. Hitherto in Prussia, a minister had been looked upon as one of the most august of personages, so august indeed that a common citizen would not venture to raise his eyes to the ministerial countenance. This fancied greatness has been humbled by the Diet. Not one of the ministers had taken part in the debates without making a public display of his incapacity. One after another, during the eleven weeks, the ministers had to run the gauntlet; the revelation of their arrogance, their shallowness, their medieval presumption, their mismanagement of the country's affairs, soon brought them into contumely, sometimes they were laughed at, or, again, their misdemeanours were condemned with an outburst of righteous wrath. Such dastardly roles have never had to be played as were played during those weeks by the "crown councillors." The lamblike Eichhorn, with his "Christian State," cut a pitiable figure before the Diet; Savigny, the unhistorical historian, had to seek cover with his historical ineptitudes, for his old Franconian wares found no purchaser in the market and he withdrew amid universal raillery. Thiele suffered a similar fate; so did Duesberg, Boyen, and others. Even Bodelschwingh's brazen-faced intervention was not capable of preserving a vestige of the halo with which the ministry had hitherto been adorned.

Every blow received by the ministers likewise hit the ruler at Potsdam. Never was a speech from the throne more scoffed at than

was the one uttered by Frederick William. At almost every sitting of the Diet it was a target for mockery and derision. No special mention was made of this lucubration, but the debates constituted a running commentary on what the Most Christian King had said on April 11th. The protest lacked neither satirical wit nor serious content. Since the debates were open to the public, since they were reported in hundreds of newspapers throughout the country, since they were explained and enlarged upon in the press, public interest in State affairs was aroused, an interest which at an earlier date could be found only in isolated instances, in the larger towns for example, and even here was very slight indeed. Now the whole land was involved. Persons who had been content to look no farther afield than the four walls of their homes, or whose gaze had hitherto not gone beyond the precincts of their own village, were taking part in the life of the State. The whole of Germany followed the work of the Diet with no less enthusiasm than did the people of Prussia itself. It was felt that every victory of the bourgeoisie in Prussia meant a victory for the German bourgeoisie in general, that the events taking place in Prussia would soon be repeated in the other States of the Germanic Federation.

But I can hear many voices raised in protest. What interest have we proletarians in the struggles of the bourgeoisie? Are not the bourgeois our bitterest foes? Have they not once more shown their contempt for us at the sessions of this very Diet, and laid bare their ill will against us during the debates upon the petition dealing with the condition of the working classes? What do we care whether the bourgeoisie becomes the ruling power or not? Nay, should we not, rather, hinder them so that they may not achieve a victory? Should we not fight on behalf of the government rather than against it?

Such questions, and the outlooks they imply, can only come from those among us who are blinded by a quite legitimate hatred of the bourgeoisie. They do not understand the present position of the proletariat, nor the means whereby emancipation can be achieved.

Of course the bourgeoisie is our enemy. Its power is based upon private property, upon capital, and all that results therefrom. We proletarians can achieve our freedom only by abolishing private property, by destroying the bourgeoisie as a class, and thereby putting an end for ever to class distinctions. A life-and-death struggle is waged

between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; and it is not merely a war of words but of deeds, of fists and muskets.

But are we proletarians in Germany in a position to change the social order and reconstitute it in our own interests? Can we already clear out the bourgeoisie and lay the foundations of a communist society? Does not yet another enemy confront us, one who takes precedence of the bourgeoisie and must be laid by the heels first if we are to get the better of the bourgeois class? Who is this other foe? It is the absolute monarch who tells us that he rules "by God's grace;" who exploits us in heaven's name, keeps us fast in the claws of the medieval landowner, confines us within the "Most Christian German" State, and sends its police, its spies, its priests, and its cannon to the help of capital every time we endeavour to throw off the galling chains that bind us. Or are we mistaken? Has the monarchy any claims on our gratitude, any reasons for expecting our aid in the fight against the bourgeoisie? What has it done that we should serve it in this way? Let us consider recent benefactions alone. During the thirty years of peace it has spent 850,000,000 talers upon the army, has used the money paid by us in taxes in order to finance dancers and royal harlots,* has fattened up at our expense an ever growing multitude of ill-mannered officials, has paid shamefully large pensions to persons who were wealthy enough already, has rendered assistance to debauched country gentlemen by means of so-called gratuities, or with money taken from the so-called charitable funds, has shown increasing consideration and respect to the aristocracy, has crushed us down to a standard of life far below that enjoyed by the royal game, has constructed houses of correction and imprisonment for us, has delivered up our labour to be exploited by capital and free competition, has extracted from us by manifold and artful devices all that remained of our wages, has turned our pockets inside out and has delivered our stomachs to be nourished by the sunshine as the cheapest way to keep life in our bodies. Could the absolute monarchy do more on our behalf? Oh yes! For Mr. Frederick William of Potsdam, yclept the fourth, has declared that the paternal government shall see that the proletarians as well shall share in the general progress! By the police labour ordinance of 1845, the working classes are more thoroughly than ever handed over to the tender

* We must except King Frederick William IV, who has no prowess among the women!—*Editorial Note.*

mercies of capitalist and employer. Every attempt at combination whereby the workers might attain a more advantageous position, either to prevent a decrease in wages or to endeavour to raise wages (and wages in any cases are hardly sufficient to provide for the barest needs), every such attempt will under the new law entail the severest penalties. So long as the capitalist keeps on the right side of the government, he is permitted any licence towards his workpeople. In the new land of master and servant, the "paternal" government permits the master of the household not only to revile his domestic in any scurrilous terms he pleases but even to beat his servants, so long as he does not actually cripple them. If the punished menial cannot show that the beating he has received at the hands of his master has crippled him, his plea is dismissed. In a secret order issued by the cabinet on June 14, 1844, the Most Christian King in Potsdam commanded the censor to see that no reference was made in the newspapers to the relations between the owning and the non-owning classes, and, further, any article dealing with the conditions of the workers as compared with those of the feudal landowners and the bourgeoisie was to be suppressed. When, in 1844, the Silesian weavers, driven by poverty and despair, rose against the factory owners, the "gracious" sovereign had the workers shot down like vermin and stuck with bayonets like pigs, while those who escaped death were tortured by the infliction of twenty to forty lashes on their bare backs. These are the benefits for which we proletarians are to thank the "Most Christian German" monarchy.

The famine year 1847 gave us yet further proofs of its benevolence. Whereas thousands of proletarians in the Rhine province, in Westphalia, in Silesia, Posen, and East Prussia were succumbing to starvation and famine fever, the "Most Christian German" monarchy and its minions were giving themselves up to orgies such as are ever at the command of luxury and idleness. But at length it dawned upon these high-born wastrels that they ought at least to appear to be doing something for the hungry masses. Consequently a law was passed prohibiting the use of potatoes in the distilling business; in addition a few other minor pieces of legislation were enacted, calculated to throw dust in the workers' eyes. Fear of the proletariat was on the increase, and it grew apace when bread riots took place in Berlin and elsewhere. Seized with anxiety, the "paternal" government made a fresh endeavour "for the benefit of the working classes." What form did this take? A councillor was despatched from Berlin to

Bremen with orders to buy up, as speedily as possible and at any price, six thousand loads of corn, and to send them without delay to the capital. The councillor approached the firm of Delin in Bremen, and produced the document empowering him to act. Since the six thousand loads were to be purchased at any price, the cornbrokers sent out their buyers in all directions. In less than two hours, prices had risen by forty gold talérs the load. They soared still higher. No more than 1,500 loads were obtainable in Bremen. The Bremen corn merchants gave orders for the purchase of all available corn in Stettin, Danzig, and other towns; the corn was sold at the enormous figures which the action of the Prussian councillor had called into being. Consequently, in a very few days, the price of corn had risen to the same preposterous figure throughout the whole extent of northern Germany. The workers had to pay three times the price that had been customary for their bread. In addition, as taxpayers, they had to make good the governmental blunder, by an even heavier contribution in taxes. The Germans call this sort of thing "paternal government"! These kings by the grace of God reign because the hungry millions can be struck down and shot if they venture to rise in their misery, what time the "gracious" sovereign is having an escutcheon made at the cost of half a million filched from the pockets of the working class, and is sending his godchild (a lad who hardly knows how to blow his nose) to London, there to become the play-thing of a royal court.

It would take too long to enumerate the full tale of iniquities ascribable to the absolute monarchy. Let these few examples suffice. This much is clear, that the absolute monarchy is just as great an enemy to us as is the bourgeoisie. What it behoves us to remember is that the bourgeoisie, if it is to establish its bourgeois rule, needs political freedoms. These freedoms are refused by the absolute monarchy. We proletarians, if we are to make use of these political freedoms as a lever to overthrow the existing order, must take an interest in the political movement of to-day, must decide to play our part in the destruction of this absolute monarchy. Thus far and no farther can we march forward shoulder to shoulder with the bourgeoisie. When the enemy "by God's grace," the "Christian" police State, the "paternal" government, has been destroyed, we shall still be faced by another foe: the bourgeoisie. By the time we come to deal with this final enemy the battleground will be easier to survey and the plan of campaign will easier to draw up.

But in so far as we fail to get together, in so far as we proletarians lack solidarity, are unorganised, do not unite our forces for the complete transformation of our position; so far likewise shall we be incompetent to deal effectively and to our own advantage either with the "paternal" system of government or with the bourgeoisie. In Germany we do not possess freedom of the press, and therefore cannot fight in our own interests; nor have we the right of public meeting. Thus we cannot talk over the social conditions, the relations between non-owners and owners, in a word, we cannot seek to enlighten one another concerning the problems which confront the proletariat as a whole. Undoubtedly our task would be made easier did we already enjoy such political freedoms as have just been mentioned; with their aid the proletariat could be more speedily organised. Precisely for these reasons is the present political struggle, demanding as it does freedom of the press and the right of association, of such vast importance to us. We shall certainly not be such idiots as to sit with hands folded quietly in our laps awaiting the day when these rights shall be conceded. If the laws make it illegal for us to act we shall e'en have to break the laws. The laws have been contrived by our enemies, by the "paternal" government, in the interests of the wealthy and the propertied classes. We who possess nothing can only be bound by the law so long as we are too weak to set it at naught. What it is forbidden us to do in the open we shall have to perform in secret. The illegal will become legal for us. The greater the obstacles lying in our path the greater must be the energy and the activity we display to remove them, so that despite all difficulties we shall organise our ranks and agree to act together in the common cause. As the old adage has it: each of us must put his own shoulder to the wheel. Verily we proletarians will never be free unless we ourselves strive after our own freedom.

Already we have instilled fear into the monarchy "by the grace of God" no less than into the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Yet at present we lack cohesion, we act as individuals often at variance one with another, we tear one another to pieces, we know not the strength of unity. Did not a few hundred proletarians, without plan, without any agreement among themselves, without a common aim, demonstrate recently in the streets of Berlin, take part in a bread riot which made the whole city tremble so that the highest authorities were rendered helpless for half a day not knowing which way to turn? Have not two highly placed dignitaries declared that Berlin, in spite of the

display of troops, would have fallen into the hands of the proletarians if the latter had only known how to utilise their forces and act in concert? For five full hours Berlin was in the hands of the working people without these same people being aware of the fact! The same phenomena are to be seen elsewhere in Prussia and throughout the whole of Germany. If it is possible for a handful of proletarians, acting alone, without a concerted plan, to make the existing order totter, then it is obvious that so soon as we are organised, united, marching forward as one man, no power will be able to cheat us of our victory. Divided, we are and shall ever be weak slaves, victims of poverty and wretchedness, a prey to the arrogance or the good will of the mighty and the rich. Organised and united, we shall without difficulty break the chains which private property and the "Most Christian German" monarchy have riveted upon us.

German Emigrants

In times of old, men strove to make a better world, to begin anew. They hoped to be happier under a fresh dispensation. There are men to-day who are striving after the same goal. Unfortunately, strive as we may, our achievements are small, for we seek our better world there where it is not to be found. Few even to-day realise that the new world is not far away, that it needs but solidarity in the ranks of the oppressed, one big push on our part, to attain it. Those who fancy they need but seek, they need but emigrate to America, that there they will find the promised land, are woefully mistaken. The better world is not there for the mere finding; the better world needs to be striven for. If we stand solidly shoulder to shoulder and help ourselves, then only will heaven come to our aid.

At one time millions of Europeans invaded the East in order to escape the tyranny of their feudal lords, or to make sure of a place in paradise by rescuing the holy sepulchre from the hands of the heathen. They imagined that by treading the soil which the Saviour himself had trod they would, while still on earth, have a foretaste of the joys in store for them in the realms above. Few, however, attained the goal of their desire; most of the multitude that flocked towards Palestine succumbed before reaching the Holy City, succumbed through illness or were put to the sword by the Turk.

Now millions of Europeans are invading the West because they believe they will find a free country and will assure a happy future

to themselves and their families. The hopes of many will be disappointed. Thousands will not be able to survive the sea passage in the overcrowded vessels and will succumb to disease before they put into an American port. Thousands will die, not, indeed, at the hand of the Turk, but at the hands of cheats and rogues who will rob them of all their goods, will destroy them body and soul, so that they will end their days in the gutter or in the workhouse. Thousands will have to offer their services to the American bourgeoisie in order to earn a living, and they will find themselves no less ruthlessly exploited than they were previously by their European masters. When their strength has become exhausted they, like their European brothers, may deem themselves lucky if they are allowed to die quietly in hospital or workhouse. Few will succeed in finding a foothold for themselves and their families.

The worthy German, who can certainly not be blamed for feeling that the rule of four and thirty sovereign princes and princelets is somewhat irksome, is especially seized with a mania for emigration. Of all emigrants he is the most easily cheated, the most often bandied from pillar to post, stripped of his possessions and misused.

In German, Dutch, and Belgian cities, in London and New York, in every place to which the Germans come and go on their journey westward, a special type of being has come into existence whose main work in life is to fleece these simple and inexperienced travellers. In England such creatures are nicknamed "land sharks," a peculiarly apt name, for they swallow with equal avidity the kreuzers of the poor and the ducats of the rich. Here in London, for instance, the very minute the emigrant ship drops anchor, the travellers are surrounded by these land sharks, are led to special dwellings, and are rarely allowed to escape so long as they have a stiver in their possession. Happy are those who have paid their passage in advance, for they, at least, are sure of arriving at their destination. The others have to remain behind, and in course of time, impelled by hunger, they are forced to rook their fellow countrymen in precisely the same way as they themselves had been rooked.—My readers will exclaim: "But can the police do nothing?" The answer is simple in the extreme. English law has it that where there is no prosecutor there can be no suit. Since these unhappy Germans do not know English, are complete strangers in the vast metropolis, and have no one to rally to their aid, they are seldom able to secure the arrest and trial of the land sharks. These have merely to dodge from one

hiding place to another and await the sailing of the vessel which shall bear their victims away. Then they can with impunity issue once more from their lairs and begin the whole sorry business anew. Even when an arrest takes place, little is gained thereby. The thief is committed for trial, but the stolen property is not recovered. Before the day of the trial dawns, our emigrant's ship will have to set sail, the victim of the theft must journey onward. Thus, since the prosecutor is no longer there to bring his suit, the land shark is allowed to go scot free. The procedure is much the same in Havre, Antwerp, Rotterdam and other ports. Those are indeed lucky who escape and arrive at New York with something in hand. But there, too, the land sharks await them. Incredible stories have been told us as to the tribulations of the German emigrants. In the next issue of our journal we shall give an account of some of these experiences, to serve as a warning. We beg our readers in the East End to send us information as to the way in which emigrants are treated.

In Germany it may well be asked: "Have we not many consuls and envoys in London? Why do not they take the matter up?"

Wherever they go, the English and the French, be they ordinary travellers or be they emigrants, seek and find the protection, advice, and support they need from the consuls and ambassadors who represent their respective nations. Not so the Germans. Especially neglected in this respect are the German proletarians who have quitted the so-called Untertanen Verband (the Union of Subjects). No sooner have they left Germany than they cease to be of any interest either to ambassador or consul. The German envoys and consuls here in Great Britain, who are paid hundreds of thousands a year by the German people, have other matters to attend to. The pious Bunsen has to found Youth Societies and Christian Associations so as to protect proletarians from the poisons of atheism and communism and to drive them back into the Most Christian German State. Other German envoys send their spies into the workers' circles, while they themselves are given up to pleasure.

Who is going to trouble about proletarians, let alone proletarians who add to their iniquities that of being republicans!

By the way, comrades, how would it be if, instead of emigrating to the distant republic of America and allowing yourselves to be fleeced in the process, you put your heads together in Germany and devised a plan whereby you would end once and for all this nonsense

about "Christian German" monarchies and states? How would it be if you requested your "fathers of their country" to take a journey to such heavens upon earth as Texas or Central Africa, places where your pious brethren would fain send you? Or may be the Russian climate might suit them better? Having got rid of them, you could establish a republic in Germany and all who wished to work would be assured of a living.—Well, what do you think? The endeavour would surely be worth the trouble; money and time would be saved, tenfold fewer victims would be sacrificed than are now losing their lives on the road to the West.

Proletarians, we bid you pause and think.

Political & Social Survey

In subsequent issues of our journal we shall give a short review of the political and social conditions in all the more civilised lands. These surveys will be written from the communist point of view. For to-day, we must content ourselves with recording, in the small space left at our disposal, no more than the more important among recent happenings.

PORTUGAL. England, France, and Spain have been instrumental in replacing forcibly on the throne a perjured queen whom the justly indignant Portuguese people had dethroned.—Proletarians dwelling in the towns have had their eyes opened and are now founding republican and communist societies.

SPAIN. A great scandal is afoot at the court. Queen Isabella, a young woman whom the old merchant of souls in Paris has married off to a creature who is no longer virile, is seeking compensation in the arms of vigorous and manly lovers. Since her ministers protest and would have her desist, she threatens to abdicate.—The treasury is empty, robber bands infest the country, trade and commerce are at a standstill.—How much longer is the Spanish people prepared to tolerate such ill-usage?

FRANCE. Louis Philippe's system of government is in the last throes. Already it is in such a state of putrefaction that the stench is spreading far and wide through the land. Sharpers, robbers, and murderers are carrying on their nefarious business almost openly. Honour and equity are virtues which the ruling classes no longer possess.—Republicans and communists stand at attention and calmly

contemplate the spectacle. As soon as the patient is dead they will bury the body, and as an initial purification will proclaim the Republic.

GERMANY. The grand duke of Hesse forbids proletarians to marry.—No matter! We can be fruitful and multiply just as well without the priest's blessing.—Lola Montez still terrorises the loyal Bavarians. Good luck to her!—Fat Frederick William in Berlin issues ordinances concerning moustaches what time he permits sentences to be passed upon the noble Poles, who wish to liberate their unhappy country.—The Prussian bourgeoisie marches slowly forward and fat Fritz and his house will in the future not only serve the Lord but also Mr. Moneybags.—Ferdinand in Vienna, is counting the panes of glass in the windows of his palace, while Metternich is thirsting after fresh blood.—The other German fathers of the people are indulging in pleasure jaunts, while the hungry German masses tighten their belts.

BELGIUM AND HOLLAND. We hear that the kings of Holland and Belgium are finding their crowns heavy to wear. They wish to abdicate and go a-travelling. Bon voyage!

GREAT BRITAIN. Feargus O'Connor, the noted Chartist, is getting a great deal of publicity for his land scheme, and its reception at the hands of the people shows how earnestly every one desires the liberation of the soil. Unfortunately O'Connor's plan is based upon the division of goods instead of on the community of goods. More about this in a subsequent issue. The parliamentary elections are now over, and many a stalwart has been sent to the House! The queen, together with Albert her consort, are travelling for their pleasure while the proletarians are suffering untold miseries. Tout comme chez nous!

SCANDINAVIA. The doctrine of the community of goods is gaining a sympathetic hearing among the Swedish people. As elsewhere, so here, the greatest foe of communism is the ecclesiastical arm. These persons' "equality" is not of this world. Your endeavours to hold back the tide are of no avail, you old black crows!

SWITZERLAND. The Jesuits and their loyal henchmen are making no end of a to-do. Metternich is supplying them with funds for their war, which is at present a war of words. It is to be hoped that the federal troops will soon take a hand in the game and send the Sonderbund packing.

ITALY. Pope Pius IX. has raised the flag of liberty and progress, and the Italian people has rallied with enthusiasm to his call. Bloodthirsty Metternich, highly displeased, wished to perpetrate a second Galician massacre in the Papal States. Since he could not bring this about, he seems disposed to use forcible measures so as to keep Italy in the trammels of obscurantism. The pope, we are told, has declared that if Metternich attacks him he will mount his horse and at the head of his people will take up arms against the Austrian mercenaries. Bravo! Even sly old Metternich has this time reckoned without his host.

HUNGARY. Here likewise, in the freest country under Austrian rule, the seed of communism has been sown and has fallen on fruitful soil.—Where shall we catch Herr Metternich napping, and how?

POLAND. At Lemberg in Galicia two noble-minded men have suffered a martyr's death. Theophil Wisniowski and Joseph Kapuscinsky died as heroes. Their last words were: "Long live Poland!" and, "Fellow men, learn from us how to die in a just cause." The people threw nosegays of flowers and wreaths to them as they marched towards the place of execution.—Poland's cause is not yet a lost cause.

RUSSIA. The valiant Circassians have once more inflicted notable defeats upon the Russians.—Here we have a practical lesson as to how those behave who really wish to be free.

TURKEY. The sultan has done away with slavery and has declared his sympathy towards the progressive movement.—O thou who with thy house servest the Lord, thou art lower than the Turk.*

GREECE. Otto of Bavaria has declared to his loyal estates that he finds himself in the most intolerable situation as regards money and that no one seems willing to lend him a penny.—O Rothschild have mercy on him!

NORTH AMERICA. North America is still at war with Mexico.—It is to be hoped that North America will get Mexico and will be able to utilise the land better than the Mexicans have done. The

* The reference is to Frederick William's speech from the throne on April 11, 1847, in which he declared: "I and my house desire to serve the Lord."—*Translators' Note.*

association which is fighting for the freedom of the soil, Young America as it is called, is day by day gaining fresh adherents.

This journal is on sale at the German bookshop, 8, Marylebone Street, Regent's Street, Quadrant; in the West End it is to be had from the educational association, 191, Drury Lane, High Holborn; in the East End, from the educational association, Castle, Goodman's Style, Whitechapel.

PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETORS BY MELDOLAS CAHN AND CO.,
18, ST. MARY AXE, CITY, LONDON.

APPENDIX F

PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM

By F. Engels

Question One: What is communism?

Answer: Communism is the doctrine of the requisites for the emancipation of the proletariat.

Question Two: What is the proletariat?

Answer: The proletariat is that class of society whose means of livelihood entirely depends on the sale of its labour and not on the profits derived from capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence depend on the demand for labour, depend on the alternations of good times and bad, on the fluctuations which are the outcome of unbridled competition. The proletariat, or class of proletarians, is, in a word, the working class of the nineteenth century.

Question Three: Have there not always been proletarians?

Answer: No. Poor folk and working classes have always existed. The working classes have for the most part been poor. But poor such as we see around us to-day, such workers as are living under present day conditions, proletarians, have not always existed, any more than free and unbridled competition has always existed.

Question Four: How did the proletariat arise?

Answer: The proletariat was created by the industrial revolution which took place in England during the second half of the eighteenth century and which has repeated itself since then in all the civilised

countries of the world. The industrial revolution took place owing to the invention of the steam-engine, of various spinning machines, of the power loom, and of a great number of other inventions in the realm of machinery. These machines were expensive and, consequently, could only be installed by persons who had plenty of capital to lay out. Their introduction completely altered the methods of production and changed the whole character of the workers engaged in running them. This was due to the fact that machinery could produce cheaper and better commodities than could the handicraftsmen with their old-fashioned spinning wheels and hand looms. Thus, the invention of machinery handed over industry to the great capitalists and rendered the workers' property (tools, hand looms, etc.), worthless. Soon the capitalist had all the means of production at their command and the workers possessed nothing. It was in the realm of textile production that the factory system was first introduced. The impetus once having been given, the factory system rapidly invaded all the other branches of production. The first to succumb were the textile and book-printing trades, pottery, and metallurgical industry. More and more did the various processes come to be divided among many workers, so that in the course of time the worker who had been wont to make the entire article with his own hands, now merely produced a part of the article. Division of labour made production speedier and the commodity could be sold cheaper. The labour of each worker was immensely simplified, his movements were mechanically repeated time after time; the machine not only performed the task just as well, but a good deal better. Gradually all industries fell under the dominion of steam power, of machinery, and of the factory system; all alike followed in the footsteps of the spinning and weaving industries. Simultaneously they also came into the hands of the great capitalists, and the workers were deprived of every shred of independence. In addition to manufacture, handicrafts likewise came to be absorbed into the factory system. The big owners of capital were all able to lay out money on the erection of workshops whereby much expense was spared and the labour could be divided among the workers. Gradually the small masters were squeezed out. This is the process by which in all civilised lands almost every branch of industry has fallen under the sway of the factory system, the process which has ousted handicraft and manufacture in favour of large-scale production. The middle class, and especially the smaller master handicraftsmen, have been slowly driven to ruin; the workers have had their existence

completely transformed; and two new classes have come into being, two classes which are absorbing all other classes of society.

On the one hand we have the class which is composed of big capitalists who, in all civilised countries, are now almost exclusive owners of the means of existence and the raw materials and instruments (machinery, factories, etc.), needed for the production of these means of existence. This class is the bourgeois class or bourgeoisie.

On the other hand the class of those who own nothing, the class of those who are compelled to sell their labour to the bourgeois in order to provide the necessary means of existence for themselves and their families. This class is called the proletarian class or proletariat.

Question Five: Under what conditions does the sale of the labour of proletarians to the bourgeoisie take place?

Answer: Labour is a commodity like any other commodity and its price is calculated according to the same laws as those which govern the price of other commodities. The price of a commodity under the dominion of large-scale industry or of free competition (the two, as we shall see, are interchangeable terms), is on the average equal to the cost of production of the commodity. The price of labour [read "labour power"] is, therefore, likewise equivalent to the cost of production of the labour. The cost of production of labour consists of that sum of the means of existence which is requisite to keep the worker fit to perform the labour and to prevent the working class from dying out. Thus the worker will not receive more for his labour than is just sufficient for the above aim. The price of labour, or wages, is the minimum, the lowest amount at which the life of the worker can be maintained. Since business is subject to ups and downs, since there are good times and bad times, the workers receive now more and then less in accordance with what the factory owner receives for his commodities. But just as the factory owner receives on the average, be the times good or be they bad, neither more nor less for his commodities than the cost of their production, so does the worker, on the average, receive neither more nor less than the minimum. The economic law of the wages of labour will come to be more stringently applied as all branches of industry are gradually absorbed by large-scale processes of production.

Question Six: What were the working classes like before the industrial revolution?

Answer: The living conditions of the working classes have varied concomitantly with variations in the stages of development of society at large; the relations of the working classes to the possessing and ruling classes have altered in like manner. In classical days the workers were the slaves of those who owned them, just as they are now in backward lands and even as they still [1847] are in the southern states of the American Union. During the middle ages the workers were serfs belonging to the lords of the soil; these relations still [1847] exist in Hungary, Poland, and Russia. In addition to serfs, there were in those medieval days in the towns handicraftsmen of various sorts whose masters were small burghers. This relationship of master and man continued down to the time of the industrial revolution when the craftsman was gradually transformed into a manufacturing worker employed by the bigger capitalists.

Question Seven: In what way are proletarians to be differentiated from slaves?

Answer: The slave is sold outright. The proletarian sells himself by the hour or by the day. Each individual slave, being the direct property of his master, has his existence assured, be that existence never so wretched. It is entirely to the interest of the slave owner that this security should be assured. Each individual proletarian, the property as it were of the whole bourgeois class, whose labour is sold only when it is needed by the owning class, has no security of life. Existence is merely guaranteed to the working class as a whole. The slave is excluded from competition; the proletarian is beset by competition and is a prey to all its fluctuations. The slave is counted a thing and not a member of society; the proletarian is looked upon as a person, as a member of bourgeois society. The slave can, therefore, secure better conditions of life than can the proletarian, though the proletarian belongs to a higher stage of development than the slave. The slave can become free by rupturing one relation of private ownership, the relation of slavery; the proletarian can achieve emancipation only by destroying private property relations in their entirety.

Question Eight: In what way is the proletarian to be distinguished from the serf?

Answer: The serf owned and utilised an instrument of production, a strip of land; in exchange he handed over a portion of the yield or he gave so many days labour to his lord. The proletarian works with instruments of production which belong to another than

himself, he labours for this other and receives a portion of the produce in return. The serf gives; the proletarian receives. Security of existence is granted to the serf but not to the proletarian. The serf is not enmeshed in the competitive struggle; the proletarian is. The serf can gain his liberty by running away to the town and there becoming a handicraftsman; or he may pay his lord in money instead of in kind, thereby becoming a free farmer; or he may get rid of his lord by one means or another and himself become a landed proprietor; in a word, he may by a variety of methods enter the ranks of the possessing class and enter the circle of competition. The proletarian can attain to freedom only by abolishing competition, private property and every class distinction.

Question Nine: In what way does the proletarian differ from the handicraftsman?

Answer: [The answer is lacking.]

Question Ten: What is the difference between the proletarian and the worker in manufacture?

Answer: The manufacturing period proper lasted from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century and during this time the worker owned his instrument of production, his loom, the family spinning wheel, and his little plot of land which he cultivated in his leisure hours. The proletarian has none of these things. The majority of manufacturing workers lived in the country under more or less patriarchal relations with his lord or his employer; the proletarian usually dwells in a large town, and his relation to his employer is purely a money relation. The manufacturing worker is compelled by the growth of large-scale industry to break with the patriarchal conditions of his life, to lose all he has, and thereby he himself becomes a proletarian.

Question Eleven: What were the first results of the industrial revolution and the division of society into bourgeois and proletarian?

Answer: In the first place the old system of manufacture or industry dependent upon hand labour was ousted by the products of machine industry, which could be put on the market at ever cheapening rates. The semi-barbarous lands, hitherto more or less inaccessible to the historical evolutionary process and whose industry had until now been the offspring of manufacturing methods, were forcibly dragged out of their isolation by the development of large-scale

industry in other countries. They bought cheap commodities from England and allowed their own manufacturing workers to perish. Thus it was that countries which had stagnated for centuries, India for example, were revolutionised from top to base; even in China such a revolution is at hand. Within a year of the introduction of a new machine into an English factory, millions of workers in China are thereby thrown out of work. Large-scale industry has brought all the peoples of the earth into relationships one with another, has transformed the hundred-and-one small local markets into one huge world market, has everywhere introduced civilisation and progress, and has arranged matters in such a way that when anything happens in the civilised countries the events have their repercussion in all other lands. Suppose, for instance, the workers of England and of France were to win their liberty to-day, this would cause revolutions to occur throughout the world which in course of time would lead to the emancipation of all other workers likewise.

Secondly, whereas large-scale industry has replaced manufacture, the bourgeoisie has developed its power and its wealth to the highest degree and has risen to the position of being the dominant class in the country. Consequently, wherever the industrial revolution took place, the bourgeoisie seized political power, and the aristocracy and the guild burgesses who had hitherto been the ruling classes, together with the absolute monarchy which was the political expression of both these classes, were elbowed out of the way. The bourgeoisie destroyed the power of the landed aristocracy in so far as entailed property and the privileges of the nobility were abolished. The bourgeoisie destroyed the power of the guild burgesses in so far as the guilds themselves were destroyed and craft privileges were abolished. Their place was taken by free competition, this meaning that to every member of society is granted the right to carry on any industry he has a fancy for, and that nothing can hinder him in this avocation but lack of the necessary capital. The introduction of free competition constitutes a public declaration that henceforward members of society are only in so far unequal as the capital they respectively own differs in quantity, that capital is the decisive factor, and that, consequently, the capitalists, the bourgeois, have become the leading class in society. Free competition is necessary in the early days of large-scale industry for it is the only social form in which this kind of industrial life can flourish. As soon as the bourgeoisie had destroyed the social power of the aristocrats and the guild burgesses, it proceeded to annihilate their

political power as well. Having become the leading class in the social order, the bourgeoisie now rose to become the leading class in the political world likewise. This was brought about by the introduction of the representative system of government which rests upon the bourgeois doctrine of equality before the law and the legal recognition of free competition. In European lands it has taken the form of constitutional monarchy. Under a constitutional monarchy those only are electors who possess a certain amount of capital; that is to say, the electors are members of the bourgeoisie. These bourgeois electors elect the deputies, and these bourgeois deputies, having the right to refuse supply, are empowered to elect a bourgeois government.

Thirdly, the proletariat grows concomitantly with the bourgeoisie. Under the identical circumstances wherein the bourgeoisie gains wealth, the proletariat gains in numbers. Since proletarians can only be employed where capital is available and since capital can only increase when it employs labour, the growth of the proletariat must go hand in hand with the growth of capital. Simultaneously, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat assemble in large cities because here the conditions are most favourable for the carrying on of industry. This herding together of great masses of human beings in one area makes the proletariat conscious of its power. As new machines are introduced, as new and newer inventions drive out handicraft production, as industry develops, wages become further and further depressed to the minimum, thereby making the proletariat's condition more and ever more unbearable. Thus, growing discontent on the part of the workers and their growing power prepare the way for a social revolution brought about by the proletariat itself.

Question Twelve: What have been the later consequences of the industrial revolution?

Answer: By means of the steam-driven machine and various other mechanical inventions, large-scale industry had the wherewithal in a short period of time and at slight expense to increase production to an almost unlimited extent. Free competition, which is the essential counterpart of large-scale production, assumed an extremely aggressive aspect, and this was mainly due to the ease with which commodities were produced. A number of capitalists hurled themselves in to industrial life, and very soon more was produced than could be utilised. Consequently, machine-made wares could not be sold, and a commercial crisis ensued. Factories were closed, factory

owners went bankrupt, and the workers went without bread. Suffering was rife. After a while the surplus products were sold, the factory wheels were again set a-going, wages went up, and gradually business was more brisk than ever. But this prosperity did not last long. Again too many commodities were produced, another crisis ensued, and ran the same course of the previous one. During the whole of this century, industrial life has fluctuated between times of prosperity and times of crisis; at intervals of from five to seven years a similar crisis has recurred, bringing in its train the intolerable wretchedness of the workers, a general revolutionary effervescence, and exposing the extant order of society to the greatest dangers.

Question Thirteen: What are the consequences of these regularly recurring commercial crises?

Answer: First, although in its initial stages large-scale industry itself gave birth to free competition, now it has outgrown its own creation. Competition and in general the carrying on of industry by individual capitalists has become a fetter upon production, and this fetter must be broken. Large-scale industry, so long as it is conducted as at present, can only recover its prosperity through a seven-yearly upheaval which is a menace to civilisation, not merely casting the proletariat into a well of misery but likewise causing the ruin of a great number of bourgeois. Either large-scale industry must be abolished, which is quite out of the question, or it needs a totally different social order wherein to function. The new social order would no longer tolerate individual factory owners competing one against the other, but would inaugurate industrial production as an affair run by the whole of society according to a settled plan and according to the needs of all the members of society.

Secondly, large-scale industry by greatly extending the scope of production makes it possible to inaugurate a social order wherein so many necessities of life are produced that every member of society will be able to develop all his energies in the fullest freedom and will be employed in such a way that precisely those qualities of large-scale industry which now contribute to the workers' misery will in another social order promote the abolition of such suffering and wretchedness. Crises and trade fluctuations will cease to be. Thus it is obvious that:

1. The miseries occasioned by large-scale production are due to conditions which are no longer compatible with the extant social order;

2. The means are ready to hand for putting an end to these miseries and for the inauguration of a new social order.

Question Fourteen: What form will this new social order assume?

Answer: First of all, the running of industries and all branches of production will be taken out of the hands of individual and competing capitalists and placed under the aegis of society as a whole; this is to say that industry will be run according to a concerted plan and that every member of society will take a share in industrial life. Competition will be done away with, and association will take its place. Since the running of industry by individual capitalists inevitably presupposes the existence of private property, and since free competition is the outcome of the individual ownership of industrial concerns, private ownership cannot be separated from free competition and individually owned industrial concerns. Thus private ownership will have to be destroyed, and in its stead we shall have the utilisation of all the instruments of production and the distribution of the products among all members of society by common agreement. In a word we shall have community of goods. The phrase *abolition of private property* is the most succinct and characteristic way of formulating the change in the social order which has been rendered necessary by the development of large-scale industry. The communists are right, therefore, to place this in the forefront of their demands.

Question Fifteen: Was the abolition of private property not possible at an earlier date?

Answer: No. Every change in the social order, every alteration in property relations, has always been the outcome of the discovery of new productive forces which cannot develop properly under the old system of property relations. Private property itself came to birth in this way. For private property has not always existed. Towards the close of the Middle Ages a new method of production was introduced. This was the manufacturing system. The new process came into conflict with the feudal and the guild property relations and created new relations more consonant with the manufacturing system of production. Hence arose what is called private property. No other property form than that of private property was possible during the period of manufacture and in the early stages of the development of large-scale industry; no other order of society

was possible than that founded upon private property. There must always be a dominant class controlling the forces of production, and a poverty-stricken, oppressed class, so long as there is not enough produced not only to supply the immediate wants of all the members of society, but also to provide a surplus of products for the increase of social capital and for the further development of the forces of production. The way in which these classes are constituted will depend upon the stage of development which the productive system has reached. The Middle Ages were dependent upon agriculture, and, consequently, we find baron contraposed by serf; during the later Middle Ages, the towns provide us with the contrast between the master guildsman and his apprentices and journeymen; the seventeenth century has manufacturers and workers in manufacture; the nineteenth century gave birth to the big factory owners and the proletariat. . . . It is obvious that hitherto the productive forces had not been developed widely enough to provide a sufficiency for all members of society; and that private property had not yet become a chain, a hindrance, to these productive forces. In our day, when the productive forces have attained so high a degree of development that (1) capitalists and productive forces are called into being on a scale hitherto unheard of and the means exist for multiplying these forces unendingly; that (2) these productive forces are concentrated in the hands of a few bourgeois whilst the great mass of the people are falling into the ranks of the proletariat, the condition of the latter becoming more wretched and unendurable concomitantly with the accumulation of wealth in the coffers of the former; that (3) these mighty and easily multiplied productive forces have vastly outgrown the bourgeois and his private property and thus constantly involve society in colossal disturbances—the abolition of private property is not only possible but necessary.

Question Sixteen: Will it be possible to bring about the abolition of private property by peaceful methods?

Answer: It is a thing greatly to be desired, and communists would be the last persons in the world to stand in the way of a peaceful solution. None know better than they the utility and, indeed, the harmfulness of conspiratorial methods. Communists are well aware that revolutions are not made deliberately and arbitrarily; they know that everywhere and at all times revolutions have been the outcome of circumstances quite independent of the will or the guidance of

particular parties or classes. They likewise perceive that the development of the proletariat is in nearly every civilised country forcibly hindered, and that the opponents of communism are tending in every possible way to promote revolution. Should the oppressed proletariat at long last be goaded into a revolution, the communists will rally to the cause of the workers and be just as prompt to act as they are now to speak.

Question Seventeen: Will it be possible to abolish private property at one blow?

Answer: No. Such a thing would be just as impossible as at one blow to multiply the extant forces of production to the degree necessary for the inauguration of communal ownership in the means of production. For this reason, the proletarian revolution which undoubtedly will break out sooner or later, will only be able gradually to transform extant society. Private property will be abolished only when the necessary quantity of means of production has been created.

Question Eighteen: What is likely to be the course of this revolution?

Answer: In the first place there will be drawn up a democratic constitution implying directly or indirectly the political rule of the proletariat. In England, for instance, where the proletariat is in the majority, the rule of the proletariat will be direct. In France and in Germany, where the majority of the population consists, in addition to proletarians, of peasants producing on a small scale and of lower middle-class citizens, it will be indirect. For the two last-named categories are only now beginning to become proletarians, and their political interests are becoming more and more dependent on those of the proletariat, so that at long last they will have to rally their forces to those of the proletariat in making joint demands. Perhaps this will entail a second fight, but it will inevitably result in the victory of the proletariat.

Democracy will be of no use to the proletariat unless it serves as the means for a direct attack upon private property and for safeguarding the existence of the proletariat. Extant relations make it necessary to introduce the following measures as being those of most importance:

1. Limitation of private ownership by means of a graduated

income tax, high death duties, abolition of inheritance by collateral lines (brothers, nephews, etc.), forced loans, and so forth.

2. Gradual expropriation of landed proprietors, factory owners, railway magnates and shipping magnates, partly through competition on the part of the State industries and partly through payment of compensation in currency notes.

3. Confiscation of the property of all emigres and rebels against the majority of the people.

4. Organisation of the labour or occupation of the proletariat on the national domains, and in the factories and workshops, thereby putting an end to competition among the workers themselves and forcing the remaining factory owners to pay the same high wages as those paid by the State.

5. Universal and equal obligation to work for all members of society until the abolition of private property is completed; organisation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

6. Centralisation of credit and finance in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and the suppression of private banks and bankers.

7. Increase of national factories, workshops, railways, and shipping, cultivation of uncultivated land and improvement of cultivated land as fast as the increase in capital and labour at the disposal of the nation permits.

8. Education of all children, as soon as they are old enough to dispense with maternal care, in national institutions and at the charge of the nation.

9. The erection of palatial dwellings on the national domains where communities of citizens shall live together for the carrying on of industry and agriculture; where the advantages of town life shall be linked with those of country life without having to suffer from the one-sidedness and the disadvantages of either.

10. The demolition of all insanitary houses or housing quarters.

11. Equal right of inheritance to be enjoyed by illegitimate as by legitimate children.

12. Concentration of the means of transport in the hands of the nation.

Of course, we cannot expect all these measures to be introduced

simultaneously. But the introduction of one will lead to the introduction of the other. Once the initial onslaught upon private ownership has been made, the proletariat will be compelled to go further, and more and more to concentrate in the hands of the State all available capital, all agriculture, all industries, all transport facilities, and all means of exchange. That is the aim of all the above-mentioned measures, and they will be realisable and the results of centralisation will develop in so far as the productive forces of the country are increased through the labour of the proletariat. Finally, when all capital, all production, and all exchange are concentrated into the hands of the nation, private ownership will have ceased to exist, money will have become superfluous, and production will have so increased and men will have so changed that the last vestiges of the old social relations will have disappeared.

Question Nineteen: Can such a revolution take place in one country alone?

Answer: No. Large-scale industry, by creating a world-market, has so linked up the peoples of the earth, and especially the civilised peoples of the earth, that each of them is dependent on what happens in other lands. Further, the social development of all civilised countries has become so similar that everywhere the struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat, the two classes of society upon which the issue depends, has become the dominating struggle of the day. The communist revolution will, therefore, not be a national revolution alone; it will take place in all civilised countries, or at least in Great Britain, the United States, France, and Germany, at one and the same time. In each of these countries it will take a longer or a shorter time to develop according to whether industrial life has attained a high degree of evolution, has amassed great wealth, and has a considerable quantity of the forces of production at its disposal. The revolution will assume its slowest pace and be most difficult of achievement in Germany; in Great Britain it will go ahead quickly and easily. It will exercise considerable influence upon all other lands, changing and hastening the process of their development. This is to be a universal revolution, and will, therefore, have the whole world as field for its operations.

Question Twenty: What will be the consequences of the final abolition of private ownership?

Answer: In so far as society has deprived the capitalists of their

private use of the forces of production, transport, exchange, and distribution, and is able to administer all these things in an orderly way according to the needs of society as a whole and according to the means at its command, all the bad results of privately owned industrial processes will be eliminated. Crises will cease to be; the increase of production, which in the present order of society spells over-production and is such a mighty cause of suffering, will not suffice the demands of the nation and will have to be greatly stimulated. Instead of bringing wretchedness in its wake, over-production will not only satisfy the immediate wants of society and the needs of all, but will create new needs, and simultaneously will create the means for their gratification. It will stimulate further progress, it will make progress actual, without, as heretofore, thereby involving society in confusion. Once liberated from the yoke of private ownership, large-scale industry will develop on a new scale that will dwarf the present machine industry as conspicuously as that has dwarfed the manufacturing system of earlier days. This huge growth of industry will provide a quantity of products sufficient to gratify all the needs of society. Similarly with agricultural production, hitherto cramped and hindered by the weight of private ownership and the excessive subdivision of farming land. Scientific methods and improvements of all sorts will soon create a flourishing agricultural industry, and society's needs will be amply provided for. Thus society will have at its disposal such a quantity of products that distribution among its members will be equitable and satisfactory. The division of society into various antagonistic classes will become superfluous. Nay, more; not only will such class divisions be superfluous, they will be incompatible with the new social order. Classes came into existence through the division of labour; the division of labour, as it has hitherto been known, will entirely disappear. Mechanical and chemical auxiliaries do not alone suffice to develop industrial and agricultural production to the heights of which they are capable. The possibilities set in motion by mankind with the aid of these auxiliaries must likewise undergo development. Just as, a century ago, the peasant and the worker in manufacture were forced to change the whole of their habits and customs, and had to become totally different human beings, when they were swept into the current of large-scale industry, so also, when communal production shall have been introduced throughout the whole of society, and when, consequently, production will undergo a new evolution, different men will be needed to carry on the work of pro-

duction, and indeed, different men will be engendered. The men of to-day cannot be expected to adapt themselves to the methods involved in communal production, for now each individual is engaged in one branch of industry to the exclusion of all others, is shackled to that branch of industry, exploited by it; he can cultivate only one of his faculties as it were at the cost of all others, knows only one branch, or indeed, only a branch of a branch of production as a whole. Contemporary industry becomes less and less capable of employing such workers as we envisage. But when the whole of society shall carry on industry, communally and purposively, then workers will be needed whose capacities have been developed from every point of view, workers capable of taking charge of the entire system of production. The division of labour already undermined by the machine system, the division of labour which compels one man to be a peasant, another a shoemaker, another a factory hand, another a broker on the stock exchange, will completely disappear. The young folk as they pass through the schools will be taught the whole system of production as part of their education, they will be in a position to pass from one branch of industry to another according as social needs shall require or as their own inclinations impel. They will no longer, as to-day, be one-sided in their development. Thus a communistically organised society will be able to provide opportunities for the cultivation of all-round capacities. Simultaneously with this development, social classes will vanish, for classes cannot exist in a communist society, and, indeed, the whole organisation of society will preclude the existence of different classes.

It follows from all this that the contrast between town and countryside will likewise disappear. The fact that agriculture and industrial production will be carried on by the same individuals, instead of by two different classes of society, lies at the very foundation of communist association and is an essential feature of such association. The sprinkling of the agricultural population throughout the countryside, in contrast with the massing of the industrial population in the towns, denotes that both agriculture and industry have reached but a very low state of development. It constitutes an obstacle to future development, an obstacle that is even now manifest.

The general association of all members of society for the common and purposive utilisation of the productive forces, the expansion of production so that it suffices to provide for the needs of all, the

cessation of those conditions whereby the satisfaction of the needs of one is effected only by the sacrifice of the needs of others, the complete destruction of classes and their antagonisms, the many-sided development of the talents of all the members of society by means of the abolition of the hitherto prevalent division of labour, by means of industrial education, by means of an alternation of employments, by means of the participation of all in the enjoyments produced by common labour, by means of the absorption of town by countryside and countryside by town—such are the main results to be expected from the abolition of private ownership.

Question Twenty-one: What influence will the communist order of society have upon the family?

Answer: It will make the relations between the sexes a purely individual, private affair which concerns only the two persons involved; a relationship which is in no way the concern of society. This attitude is made possible because private property will have been abolished and the children will be communally educated. Thereby the two foundations stones of hitherto extant forms of marriage (the dependence of the wife upon her husband and of the children upon the parents) will have been abolished. This is an answer to the outcry made by "respectable" citizens against the "community of wives." Community of wives is a peculiarity of bourgeois society; it is brought to its highest point of perfection by the community of women which is called prostitution. Prostitution is rooted in private ownership; destroy the latter and prostitution disappears. Far from inaugurating an era of communal ownership of women, a communistic organisation of society puts an end to such a condition of things.

Question Twenty-two: How will the problem of nationalities be dealt with under communist regime?

[No answer is given in the original.]

Question Twenty-three: How will the various religions be dealt with under communism?

[No answer is given.]

Question Twenty-four: In what way are communists different from socialists?

Answer: So-called socialists may be divided into three groups.

The first group consists of hangers-on of the feudal and

patriarchal form of society which has been or is being destroyed by the growth of large-scale industry and international commerce, and by the bourgeois society which these two have brought into existence. This group advocates the following remedy for the evils in present-day society: re-establish the feudalist order and all will be well, for under feudalism these evils did not exist. All their proposals lead directly or indirectly to this goal. These reactionary socialists, despite their sympathetic bearing towards the miseries of the proletariat, must be strenuously opposed by the communists, for the following reasons:—

1. They are striving after the impossible;
2. They are endeavouring to re-establish the rule of the aristocracy, the guild masters and the manufacturers, with their retinue of absolute or feudalist monarchs or officials, soldiery and priests; a society which was free, it is true, from present-day evils, but which nevertheless had quite as many evils of its own; a society, moreover, offering no hopes of the rise of a communist organisation which would free the workers from the oppression under which they laboured;
3. They reveal their genuine sentiments whenever the proletariat assumes a revolutionary or communistic demeanour; in which case our feudalist socialists incontinently rally to the side of the bourgeoisie and leave the proletariat in the lurch.

The second group is composed of hangers-on of our contemporary social order, of people who are anxious lest the evils which are the inevitable outcome of the present social order should bring this society down to destruction. They are, therefore, endeavouring to keep the present social order intact while at the same time eliminating the evils arising from it. With this end in view, some of them propose various welfare regulations, while others among them advocate reforms on the grand scale. Under pretext of reorganising society, these worthies would gladly retain the foundations of the present-day social order, which is as much as to say they wish to retain the present state of things intact. These bourgeois socialists will have likewise to be persistently opposed by the communists, for they are working with the foes of communism and are defending that very social order which the communists are out to destroy.

Finally, the third group is made up of democratic socialists. These accept some of the measures advocated by the communists in

the answer to Question Eighteen, but they do not look upon such demands as merely temporary measures for the period of transition to communism. For them such claims would appear to be sufficient for the abolition of poverty and all the other evils of extant society. These democratic socialists are either proletarians who are not yet awake to the conditions necessary to their own emancipation, or they are members of the petty bourgeoisie, a class which, until a democratic regime has been established and until the social measures necessitated by such a regime have been inaugurated, has many interests in common with the proletariat. At critical moments, therefore, the communists will have to make common cause with the democratic socialists, and temporarily at least to co-operate in a general line of action. But they can do this only so long as the democratic socialists do not enter the service of the ruling bourgeoisie and refrain from attacking the communists. It is obvious, however, that such common action does not exclude the discussion of theoretical differences.

Question Twenty-five: What must be the attitude of the communists to the remaining political parties of our day? [1847].

Answer: Conditions necessarily differ from country to country. In Great Britain, France, and Belgium, where the bourgeoisie is supreme, the communists have for the nonce interests in common with those of the various democratic parties. This Community of interests is all the greater in proportion to the extent to which the democrats now advocate socialistic measures approximating to the aims of the communists; in proportion, that is to say, to the extent to which they definitely represent proletarian interests, and rely upon the proletariat for support. In England, for instance, the Chartists, almost to a man members of the working class, are incalculably nearer to the communist position than are the democratically-minded petty bourgeois or so-called radicals.

In the United States, which enjoys a democratic constitution, the communists must make common cause with those who are utilising this constitution in the interests of the proletariat and against the bourgeoisie. This means that the communists will have to work side by side with the agrarian national reformers.

In Switzerland the radicals, although they form a very mixed company, are yet the only people with whom the communists can combine. Among the radicals, those in the cantons of Vaud and of Geneva are the most advanced.

In Germany matters are only now coming to a head between the bourgeoisie and the absolute monarchy. Since, however, the communists cannot deal with the bourgeoisie until the latter has risen to power, it is in the interests of communism that the communists should help the bourgeoisie to attain that power as speedily as possible, and, subsequently, to overthrow that power as speedily as possible. Communists must, therefore, rally to the support of the liberal bourgeoisie in its struggle with the monarchical government. But they must ever be on their guard lest they should come to believe the misleading assurances of the bourgeoisie that its victory will in any way bring solace to the proletariat. The only advantages accruing to the communists from a victory of the bourgeoisie would be: first, various concessions which would render the communists' tasks of defending their principles and discussing and spreading their ideas less arduous, so that they could bring about the unification of the proletariat, could succeed in making of it a compact, well organised and combative class; and secondly, they will have become fully aware that, from the day on which the absolute monarchy has been overthrown, the war between bourgeoisie and proletariat will have been declared. Henceforward, the tactics and policy of the German communists will be the same as for communists in other lands, where the bourgeoisie has already risen to power.

APPENDIX G

RULES AND CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Proletarians of all lands, unite!

PART I. THE LEAGUE

Article 1. The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the bourgeois social order founded upon class antagonisms, and the inauguration of a new social order wherein there shall be neither classes nor private property.

Article 2. Conditions for membership are:

(a) the way of living and the activities of the members shall be consonant with these aims;

(b) the members shall be filled with revolutionary energy and with zeal for the propagation of these ideas;

(c) they shall make communism their creed;

(d) they must abstain from participation in any other communist, political, or nationalist society, and must inform the competent authorities of the League as to whether they are members of any other body;

(e) they shall obey the decisions of the League;

(f) they shall not disclose any matters concerning the internal life of the League;

(g) the communes shall have to be unanimous in acceptance of new members.

Those who do not observe these conditions shall be expelled. (See below, Part VIII.)

Article 3. All members are equal, are brothers, and as such they owe one another helpful service in every emergency.

Article 4. All who enter the league shall assume special membership names.

Article 5. The League is organised into communes, circles, leading circles, central committee, and congress.

PART II. THE COMMUNE

Article 6. The commune shall consist of not less than three and not more than twenty members.

Article 7. Each commune shall elect a chairman and an assistant. The chairman shall preside over the meetings, the assistant shall take charge of the finances and shall replace the chairman should the latter fail to appear.

Article 8. New members shall be enrolled by the chairman and the proposer, after the commune has agreed to accept him or her.

Article 9. The communes are not to know one another or to carry on any correspondence with one another.

Article 10. Each commune shall adopt a distinguishing name.

Article 11. Any member changing his dwelling place shall previously inform the chairman of his commune.

PART III. THE CIRCLE

Article 12. The circle shall consist of not less than two and not more than ten communes.

Article 13. The chairmen and assistants of the communes shall constitute the circle committee. This shall elect a president from among its own members. Correspondence is to be maintained by the circle both with the communes and the leading circle.

Article 14. The circle committee is the fully accredited authority for all the communes it represents.

Article 15. Isolated communes must either affiliate to the most conveniently situated circle or they must get into touch with other isolated communes so as to form a new circle.

PART IV. THE LEADING CIRCLE

Article 16. The various circle of a land or a province are subject to a leading circle.

Article 17. The allotment of the circles of the League to provinces and the nomination of the leading circle is the business of the congress acting under the advice of the central committee.

Article 18. The leading circle is the fully accredited authority for the aggregate of circles in a province. It corresponds with the circles and with the central committee.

Article 19. Newly-formed circles shall affiliate to the nearest leading circle.

Article 20. Provisionally, the leading circles are responsible to the central committee and in the last resort are answerable to congress.

PART V. THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Article 21. The central committee is the executive authority of the whole League, and as such must render account to the congress.

Article 22. It consists of at least five members and is chosen from among the circle committees of the place where the congress is convened.

Article 23. The central committee corresponds with the leading circles and every three months issues a report upon the condition of the League as a whole.

PART VI. GENERALITIES

Article 24. The communes, the circle committees, and the central committees shall meet at least once a fortnight.

Article 25. The members of the circle committees and of the central committee are elected for one year; they are eligible for re-election; they are subject to recall at any time by those who elected them.

Article 26. The elections take place in September.

Article 27. The circle committees must guide the discussions of the communes in conformity with the aims of the League.

Should the central committee deem the discussion of certain questions to be of general interest, it shall suggest their discussion by the whole League.

Article 28. Individual members shall communicate at least once a quarter, and the individual communes at least once a month, with their respective circle committees.

Each circle shall communicate at least every two months with its leading circle; every leading circle shall send in a report to the central committee at least once a quarter.

Article 29. It is incumbent upon each committee of the League, on its own responsibility but within the limits imposed by the rules and regulations, to carry out such measures as may be needed for the safety and effective activity of the League. It must promptly report upon these matters to the higher authorities of the League.

PART VII. THE CONGRESS

Article 30. The congress is the legislative authority of the League. Proposals for the alteration of the rules shall be sent in to the central committee by the leading circles. They will then be laid before the congress.

Article 31. Each circle sends one delegate.

Article 32. A circle composed of less than 30 members shall send one delegate; of less than 60 members, two delegates; of less than 90 members, three delegates. A circle can be represented by a proxy delegate. In such a case the delegate must be given very precise instructions.

Article 33. The congress shall assemble each year in the month of August. In case of great urgency, the central committee can summon an extraordinary congress.

Article 34. The congress decides the place which the central committee shall make its headquarters for the coming year. It also decides the place where the congress shall next meet.

Article 35. The central committee takes part in the congress in a deliberative capacity only.

Article 36. After each meeting the congress shall issue, in addition to its circular, a manifesto in the name of the party.

PART VIII. OFFENCES AGAINST THE LEAGUE

Article 37. Any infringement of the conditions for membership (see Article 2) shall be followed, according to circumstances, either by suspension or expulsion.

A member once expelled cannot be accepted into the League again.

Article 38. The congress alone can decide upon expulsion.

Article 39. A member may be suspended by the circle or by the isolated commune to which he belongs. But the higher authorities must immediately be informed. The final decision rests with the congress in such cases likewise.

Article 40. A suspended member can be reinstated by the central committee at the request of the circle concerned.

Article 41. Any act inimical to the League comes under the jurisdiction of the circle authorities, who are also responsible for enforcing whatever decision they may arrive at.

Article 42. Expelled or suspended members, and likewise all persons under suspicion should, for the sake of the League, be supervised and rendered harmless. Any machinations on the part of such individuals are to be instantly reported to the commune concerned.

PART IX. FINANCE

Article 43. The congress decides the minimum amount that shall be contributed by each member of the League.

Article 44. Half of such contributions shall go to the central

committee; the remaining sum shall go to the funds of the circle or the commune.

Article 45. The funds accruing to the central committee shall be utilised as follows:

1. To defray the costs of correspondence and administration;
2. To pay for printing and circulating propaganda leaflets;
3. To send out emissaries, appointed by the central committee, for the carrying out of special missions.

Article 46. The funds accruing to the local committees shall be spent as follows:—

1. In paying costs of correspondence;
2. In printing and circulating propaganda leaflets;
3. In sending out special emissaries.

Article 47. Communes and circles neglecting to send in their contributions to the central committee for a period of six months shall be suspended by the central committee.

Article 48. The circle committees shall send in an account of receipts and expenditure at least every three months to their communes. The central committee shall render account to the congress as to administrative expenditure and as to the condition of the League's finances. Any tampering with the funds belonging to the League will be rigorously dealt with.

Article 49. Extraordinary expenditure and the congress expenses will be covered by special contributions.

PART X. NEW MEMBERS.

Article 50. The chairman of the commune shall read the applicant Articles 1 to 49, shall explain their significance, and shall then in a short speech emphasise the responsibilities membership of the League entails. The aspirant shall then be asked: "Do you still wish to enter the League?" Should the answer be in the affirmative, the chairman puts the aspirant on his honour to fulfil the duties of a League member, pronounces him to be a member of the League, and takes him to the next meeting of the commune.

London, December 8, 1847.

In the name of the Second Congress, held in the autumn of 1847,

The Secretary—
(Signed) ENGELS

The President—
(Signed) CARL SCHAPPER

APPENDIX H

DEMANDS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN GERMANY.

(See pp. 152 and 252)

Motto: Proletarians of all lands, unite!

1. The whole of Germany shall be declared to be a one and indivisible republic.

2. Every German, having attained the age of 21, and provided he has not been a condemned criminal, shall be eligible both for election and as elector.

3. Representatives of the people shall be salaried so that manual workers, too, shall be able to become members of the German parliament.

4. Universal arming of the people. In future the army shall be simultaneously a worker-army, so that the military arm shall not, as in the past, merely consume, but shall produce more than is actually necessary for its upkeep.

This will likewise be an aid to the organisation of labour.

5. Gratuitous legal services.

6. All feudal dues, exactions, corvees, tithes, etc., which have hitherto pressed upon the rural population, shall be abolished without compensation.

7. Royal and other feudal domains, together with mines, pits, and so forth, shall become the property of the State. The domains shall be cultivated on the large scale and with the most up-to-date scientific devices in the interests of the whole of society.

8. Mortgages on peasant lands shall be declared the property of the State. Interest on such mortgages shall be paid by the peasant to the State.

9. In localities where farming methods are well developed, the landrent or the earnest money shall be paid to the State as a tax.

The measures advocated in Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 have been put

forward with a view to decreasing the burdens hitherto imposed upon the peasantry and the small farmers, without cutting down the means available for defraying State expenses and without imperilling production.

The landed proprietor who is neither a peasant nor a farmer, has no share in production. Consumption on his part is, therefore, unwarrantable.

10. A State bank, whose paper issues are legal tender, shall replace the many private banking concerns now in existence.

By this method credit can be regulated in the interest of the people as a whole, and thereby the dominion of the magnates of the monetary world will be undermined. Further, by gradually substituting paper money for gold and silver coin, the means of exchange (that indispensable prerequisite of bourgeois trade and commerce) will be cheapened, and gold and silver will be set free for use in foreign commerce. This measure in the long run is necessary in order to bind the interests of the conservative bourgeoisie to the cause of the revolution.

11. All the means of transport, railways, waterways, steamships, roads, etc., shall be taken over by the State. They shall become the property of the State and shall be placed at the disposal of the non-possessing classes gratuitously, for their own use.

12. Salaries of all civil servants shall be identical, except in the case where a civil servant has a family to support. His requirements being greater, his salary shall be higher.

13. Complete separation of Church and State. The clergy of every denomination shall be paid by the voluntary contributions of their congregations.

14. The right of inheritance to be curtailed.

15. The introduction of a steeply graduated income tax, and the abolition of taxes on articles of consumption.

16. Inauguration of national workshops. The State guarantees a livelihood to all workers and provides for those who are incapacitated for work.

17. Universal and gratuitous education.

It is to the interest of the German proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie, and the small peasantry to support these demands with all

possible energy. Only by the realisation of these demands will the millions in Germany who have hitherto been exploited by a handful of persons and whom the exploiters would fain still keep in subjection, win the rights and attain to the power which they, as the producers of all wealth, are entitled to expect.

The Committee:

KARL MARX
H. BAUER
J. MOLL

KARL SCHAPPER
F. ENGELS
W. WOLFF

APPENDIX J

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE LEADING
EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE SOCIALIST
AND WORKING CLASS MOVEMENTS
FROM 1500 TO 1848

- 1516. *Utopia*, by Thomas More (1478-1535).
- 1525. Great peasant war in Germany. Twelve points in the peasants' program. In Thuringia, religious communistic teaching among the urban poor. The leading protagonist of these doctrines was Thomas Munzer, who was cast into gaol in 1525 (born 1490).
- 1534-1535. The rule of the Anabaptists in Munster. Johann Matthyszoon, a baker from Haarlem; Johann Bock-holdt, a tailor from Leyden; these were religious communists.
- 1549. Robert Kett's rebellion in England. The rebels consisted of peasants and handicraftsmen from Norfolk, one of the centres of the wool industry. Kett was hanged.
- 1568-1579. Rebellion of the Netherlands against the Spanish dominion, and the rise of the independent States. Holland becomes the sanctuary for the refugees from among the revolutionary Protestants and Anabaptists.
- 1623. *The City of the Sun*, by Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639).
- 1642-1658. The Great Rebellion in England. The Levellers as the representatives of revolutionary democracy. Their demands:

- single-chamber government; electoral rights for all citizens who had reached the age of 21; annual parliaments; freedom of conscience; direct taxes on property; a national militia; local self-government; the abolition of all privileges. Leading representative of the Levellers was John Lilburne (1615-1657).
1649. Sanguinary repression of the Leveller's rising by Cromwell.
1649. The Diggers, or "true Levellers," denounced private landowning, and seized some unoccupied ground which was to be cultivated communally, for the general advantage.
1652. Gerrard Winstanley's *Law of Freedom in a Platform*. Winstanley had been the leader of the Diggers.
1656. *Oceana*, by James Harrington (1611-1677). A utopia, an ideal State founded upon an equitable distribution of landed property.
1695. The proposal to found an institute of labour for all industries and for agriculture which shall bring profit to the rich, sufficient abundance to the poor, and shall provide an excellent education for the young. The author, John Bellers (1654-1725), whom Marx describes as a veritable phenomenon in the history of political economy, advocated the inauguration of co-operative labouring colonies, which should put an end to contemporary educational methods and the division of labour, and should substitute for these the combination of productive manual labour and brain work.
1735. Jean Meslier (1664-1729): *Testament*. Meslier was a French parish priest and a communist. His testament only existed in Manuscript until Voltaire published an extract from it in 1762. The testament contains a severe criticism of ecclesiastical, political and social conditions in France during the first third of the eighteenth century. It summons all nations to a common fight against tyrants; advocates communal ownership as the basis of society; proposes the formation of isolated communist groups linked together by a general pact; abolition of religions; free marriage.
1755. *The Code of Nature's Laws*, by Morelly. Abolition of private property. Obligatory labour for all from 20 years of age to 40. Between the ages of 20 to 25, agricultural labour to be obligatory for all citizens. Marriage to be binding for 10 years. Communal

education for children. Administration of the State by a president elected for a life term.

1776. *Principles of Legislation*, by Mably (1709-1785). The incompatibility of equality with the existence of private property, which latter he regards as the source of all evil.
- 1760-1832. Industrial Revolution in Great Britain.
- 1793-1794. The fraction of the "mad" in the Paris sections; Jean Roux, Varley, Leclerc; in close relationship with proletarian elements; advocated decisive measures against speculators and strict regulation of the supply of provisions.
1796. The Conspiracy of the Equals headed by Babeuf (1760-1797) and his companions (Darthe and Buonarroti); communist; seizure of political power; dictatorship; execution of Babeuf and Darthe.
- 1792-1795. The beginning of the revolutionary working-class movement in England; foundation of the London Corresponding Society. Thomas Hardy (1752-1832) and John Thelwall (1767-1834). Prosecution of the British Jacobins.
1793. *Political Justice*, by William Godwin (1756-1836).
1798. Arrest of the whole committee of the London Corresponding Society.
1799. Prohibition of all working-class societies and unions in Great Britain.
- 1798-1850. *System der Sittenlehre* (1798), and *Exclusive Mercantile State* by Johann Fichte (1762-1814).
1805. *Action of Civilisation on the Masses*, by Charles Holly (1745-1825). Pointed out the antagonisms extant in the capitalist order; the growth of wealth and the increase in poverty; the need for the abolition of inequality in the matter of possessions.
1808. *Theorie des quatre mouvements*, by Charles Fourier (1772-1837). Two other important works by the same author: *Traite de l'association agricole domestique*, published in 1822, and *Le nouveau monde industriel*, published in 1829 and 1830.
- 1812-1813. *New View of Society* (1813) by Robert Owen (1771-1858). In 1815 his *Observations on the Influence of the Manufacturing System* appeared; in 1817 he publicly broke with established

- religions; in 1819 he issued his first appeal to the workers; in 1821 appeared his *Social System*, wherein he already championed the communist outlook.
- 1812- *Wissenschaft der Logik*, by George Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831).
1816. In 1821 Hegel's *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*; the principle of the dialectical development of all phenomena.
1817. *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, by David Ricardo (1772-1823).
1817. *L'Industrie*, by Saint-Simon (1760-1825). In 1821, *Du Systeme industriel* was published; in 1824 *Catechisme des industriels*; in 1828 *Nouveau Christianisme*.
- 1816- Revival of the revolutionary movement in England.
1823. The Society of Spencean Philanthropists (Thomas Spence, 1750-1814), was out for the nationalisation of the land and for electoral reforms. The radical clubs. The agitation carried on by William Cobbett (1762-1835) and Henry Hunt (1773-1835).
1819. In August, Hunt chaired meeting in St. Peter's Field, Manchester, which was dispersed by an armed force—Peterloo massacre.
1820. The Cato Street conspiracy of Thistlewood (1770-1820), and his companions, all of them members of the Spencean Society. Thistlewood and four others were executed for high treason.
1824. Repeal of the Combination Laws in Great Britain.
1825. The first commercial and industrial crisis. Owen's attempt to found his colony, The New Harmony, in Indiana, U.S.A.
1828. *The History of Babeuf's Conspiracy*, by Michel Buonarroti (1761-1837).
1830. The July revolution.
1831. The Lyons workers rise in revolt. A big stir among the workers of Britain.
1832. The "great" electoral reforms in Britain. Owen's equitable labour exchange system, with labour notes, to supersede middlemen and the ordinary means of exchange.

- 1834. Foundation of the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. New Poor Law Act, 1833-1834. Owen's co-operative experiments.
- 1836. Foundation of the London Workingmen's Association. William Lovett (1800-1877) and Henry Heatherington (1792-1849). The beginning of the Chartist organisation.
- 1838. The publication of the People's Charter.
- 1833. Abortive rising of the German revolutionists at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. Carl Schapper (1813-1870).
- 1834. The Exiles' League, founded in Paris by Jacob Venedey (1805-1871) and Theodore Schuster (born 1807).
- 1832-1837. Weidig's (1791-1837) and Georg Buchner's (1813-1857) agitation among the peasantry of Hesse. *Hessischer Landbote*, by Buchner. Weidig, Wilhelm Liebknecht's uncle, committed suicide in prison.
- 1836. Foundation of the Federation of the Just, in Paris. Carl Schapper, Heinrich Bauer, the shoemaker, and Wilhelm Weitling the tailor, among its members.
- 1837. Feargus O'Connor founds the "Northern Star."
- 1838. *Die Menschheit, wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte* (*Humanity as it is and as it should be*), by Wilhelm Weitling (1808-1870).
- 1839. Unsuccessful attempt by August Blanqui (1805-1871) and Armand Barbes (1809-1870) to raise a revolt in Paris on May 12th. Chartist congress held in London. Agreement between the protagonists of moral force (Lovett) and physical force (Feargus O'Connor [1794-1855]). The first national petition containing 1,280,000 signatures. The arrest of the majority of the congress. *L'organisation du travail* (*the Organisation of Labour*), by Louis Blanc (1811-1882).
- 1840. Foundation of the National Charter Association. Schapper and Bauer, forced to leave Paris after the May rising, go to London and form the German Workers' Educational Society, which subsequently took the name of Communist Workers' Educational Society.

Qu'est ce que la propriete (What is Property), by Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865).

Voyage en Icarie, by Etienne Cabet (1788-1865).

1841. *Das Wesen des Christentums*, by Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872).
1842. *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit*, by Weitling. Second congress of the Chartists held in London. Second national petition containing this time 3,315,752 signatures. Attempt to bring about a general strike. Climax of the agitation of the Anti-Corn Law League.
1843. *Code of Laws of the Commune*, by Theodore Dezamy (died in 1850). Karl Marx (1818-1883), after the suppression of the "Rheinische Zeitung," emigrates to Paris. Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), at this time in Manchester, studies the condition of the working class in England.
1844. "Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher." Articles by Marx on Hegel's Philosophy of Right, and by Engels on *Outline Critique of Political Economy*. Rising of the Silesian weavers. Armed troops attack the villages of Peterswaldau and Langenwaldau. Transference of the Chartists' central organ, the "Northern Star," to London. George Julian Harney (1817-1899), influenced by Engels, becomes a communist.
1845. Foundation of an international society called the Fraternal Democrats. Schapper, Harney and Oborsky, a Pole, became members.
Die heilige Familie (The Holy Family), by Marx and Engels.
Die Lage der arbeitende Klasse in England (The Condition of the Working Class in England), by Friedrich Engels.
 Foundation of the League for the Realisation of an Agricultural Plan by O'Connor, who advocated distribution of small lots of land to the workers for cultivation. Bronterre O'Brien (1805-1864) opposes this scheme and champions land nationalisation.
1846. The Cracow rising. Repeal of the Corn Laws in Britain.
1847. The Ten Hours Law for women and children passed by the British Parliament.

Misere de la philosophie (The Poverty of Philosophy), by Karl Marx. Communist congress in London. Foundation of the Communist League. Marx and Engels are commissioned to draw up a program.

1848. The *Communist Manifesto* published. The February revolution in France. The March revolutions in Austria and Germany.
1859. *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie (Critique of Political Economy)*, by Karl Marx.
1864. The International Workingmen's Association founded.
1867. *Das Kapital (Capital)*, by Karl Marx.
1871. The Paris Commune.
-

[See P. 225, 17th Line. The following foot-note was omitted].

* At the opening of the United Diet, Frederick William IV in his speech had said: "As the heir of an unimpaired crown which I must and will preserve unimpaired for those that shall succeed me.....etc."—Translator's Notes.

